

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO

ORAL HISTORY, 1971-72

Interviewee: Sixteen members of the University of Nevada, Reno, community

Interviewed: 1971-1972

Published: 1972

Interviewer: Ruth G. Hilts

UNOHP Catalog #055

Description

Volume Two in this series contains sixteen interviews of members of the University of Nevada, Reno community, in a joint project conducted by the Oral History Program and University Archives. Those interviewed were: Robert E. McDonough, president, Alumni Association; Professor Eugene K. Grotegut, president, American Association of University Professors; William W. Otani, president, Asian-American Alliance; Daniel J. Klaich, president, Associated Students of the University of Nevada (ASUN); Robert P. Mastroianni, chief justice, ASUN Judicial Council; Richard L. Elmore, president, ASUN Senate; Laurie Albright, Senior Women's senator, Finance and Publications, ASUN Senate; Emerson S. Davis, past president, Black Student Union; Harold Jacobsen, chairman, Board of Regents; John P. Marschall, director, Center for Religion and Life; Professor Robert M. Gorrell, chairman, Faculty Senate Code Committee; Dean Roberta Barnes, chairman, Commission on the Status of Women; Professor Hugh N. Mozingo, chairman, Faculty Senate; Kenneth J. Carpenter, member, Faculty Senate Athletic Program Study Committee; Professor Anthony L. Lesperance, chairman, Intercollegiate Athletics Board; Abbas Ali Lakhani, president, International Students Club.

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO
ORAL HISTORY, 1971-72

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO
ORAL HISTORY, 1971-72

An Oral History Conducted by Ruth G. Hilts

University of Nevada Oral History Program

Copyright 1972
University of Nevada Oral History Program
Mail Stop 0324
Reno, Nevada 89557
unohp@unr.edu
<http://www.unr.edu/oralhistory>

All rights reserved. Published 1972.
Printed in the United States of America

Publication Staff:
Director: Mary Ellen Glass

University of Nevada Oral History Program Use Policy

All UNOHP interviews are copyrighted materials. They may be downloaded and/or printed for personal reference and educational use, but not republished or sold. Under “fair use” standards, excerpts of up to 1000 words may be quoted for publication without UNOHP permission as long as the use is non-commercial and materials are properly cited. The citation should include the title of the work, the name of the person or people interviewed, the date of publication or production, and the fact that the work was published or produced by the University of Nevada Oral History Program (and collaborating institutions, when applicable). Requests for permission to quote for other publication, or to use any photos found within the transcripts, should be addressed to the UNOHP, Mail Stop 0324, University of Nevada, Reno, Reno, NV 89557-0324. Original recordings of most UNOHP interviews are available for research purposes upon request.

CONTENTS

Preface to the Digital Edition	ix
Introduction	xi
1. Alumni Association <i>Robert E. McDonough, President</i>	1
2. American Association of University Professors <i>Professor Eugene K. Grotegut, President</i>	5
3. Asian-American Alliance <i>William W. Otani, President</i>	13
4. Associated Students of the University of Nevada <i>Daniel J. Klaich, President</i>	25
5. Associated Students of the University of Nevada Judicial Council <i>Robert P. Mastroianni, Chief Justice</i>	41
6. Associated Students of the University of Nevada Senate <i>Richard L. Elmore, President</i>	51
7. Associated Students of the University Of Nevada Senate <i>Laurie Albright, Senior Women's Senator, Finance and. Publications</i>	65

8. Black Student Union	81
<i>Emerson S. Davis, Past President</i>	
9. Board of Regents	93
<i>Harold Jacobsen, Chairman</i>	
10. Center for Religion and Life	111
<i>John P. Marschall, Director</i>	
11. Code Committee	119
<i>Professor Robert M. Gorrell, Chairman</i>	
12. Commission on Status of Women	131
<i>Dean Roberta Barnes, Chairman</i>	
13. Faculty Senate	137
<i>Professor Hugh N. Mozingo, Chairman</i>	
14. Faculty Senate Athletic Program Study Committee	153
<i>Kenneth J. Carpenter, Member</i>	
15. Intercollegiate Athletics Board	165
<i>Professor Anthony L. Lesperance, Chairman</i>	
16. International Students Club	177
<i>Abbas Ali Lakhani, President</i>	
Original Index: For Reference Only	191

PREFACE TO THE DIGITAL EDITION

Established in 1964, the University of Nevada Oral History Program (UNOHP) explores the remembered past through rigorous oral history interviewing, creating a record for present and future researchers. The program's collection of primary source oral histories is an important body of information about significant events, people, places, and activities in twentieth and twenty-first century Nevada and the West.

The UNOHP wishes to make the information in its oral histories accessible to a broad range of patrons. To achieve this goal, its transcripts must speak with an intelligible voice. However, no type font contains symbols for physical gestures and vocal modulations which are integral parts of verbal communication. When human speech is represented in print, stripped of these signals, the result can be a morass of seemingly tangled syntax and incomplete sentences—totally verbatim transcripts sometimes verge on incoherence. Therefore, this transcript has been lightly edited.

While taking great pains not to alter meaning in any way, the editor may have removed false starts, redundancies, and the “uhs,” “ahs,” and other noises with which speech is often liberally sprinkled; compressed some passages which, in unaltered form, misrepresent the chronicler's meaning; and relocated some material to place information in its intended context. Laughter is represented with [laughter] at the end of a sentence in which it occurs, and ellipses are used to indicate that a statement has been interrupted or is incomplete...or that there is a pause for dramatic effect.

As with all of our oral histories, while we can vouch for the authenticity of the interviews in the UNOHP collection, we advise readers to keep in mind that these are remembered pasts, and we do not claim that the recollections are entirely free of error. We can state, however, that the transcripts accurately reflect the oral history recordings on which they were based. Accordingly, each transcript should be approached with the

same prudence that the intelligent reader exercises when consulting government records, newspaper accounts, diaries, and other sources of historical information. All statements made here constitute the remembrance or opinions of the individuals who were interviewed, and not the opinions of the UNOHP.

In order to standardize the design of all UNOHP transcripts for the online database, most have been reformatted, a process that was completed in 2012. This document may therefore differ in appearance and pagination from earlier printed versions. Rather than compile entirely new indexes for each volume, the UNOHP has made each transcript fully searchable electronically. If a previous version of this volume existed, its original index has been appended to this document for reference only. A link to the entire catalog can be found online at <http://oralhistory.unr.edu/>.

For more information on the UNOHP or any of its publications, please contact the University of Nevada Oral History Program at Mail Stop 0324, University of Nevada, Reno, NV, 89557-0324 or by calling 775/784-6932.

Alicia Barber
Director, UNOHP
July 2012

INTRODUCTION

This is the second volume of the University of Nevada, Reno, Oral History, the product of an ongoing program of the Oral History Project and the University Archives. Sixteen members of the University community, selected by virtue of their leadership of boards, committees, or campus organizations, contributed their comments on events and issues, goals and achievements, during their past year in office.

Individual tape recording sessions lasted from half an hour to two hours, the length determined solely by the interviewee's available time and desire to continue speaking. Remarks were transcribed, rough-edited, and returned to the author for his reading, correcting, and approval. In submitting scripts for review, it was stressed that the oral quality should be preserved, and except for occasional minor word changes, for clarity's sake, most acceded. The resulting scripts may lack the literary polish their authors may have desired, but have, instead, the immediacy and impact of the spoken word.

All but two of those invited to participate did so; one asked that he be included in next year's volume instead. One significant omission is a segment by the editor of the campus newspaper, Sagebrush, which is regrettable because a person in that position is usually aware of all events and takes more than usual interest in the issues of a campus year. He was unable to schedule a time for the desired interview. A third regrettable omission is the interview with a representative of the American Indian Association. The interview was successfully completed but the author failed to return the transcript, thereby depriving us of its use.

At the conclusion of the taping sessions, it seemed obvious that the objective—to assemble as wide-ranging and diverse views as possible—was achieved. Specific events, especially those which galvanized the entire University community, elicited a spectrum of interpretations that today's reader will, we hope, find interesting, and that tomorrow's researcher should find

illuminating. The scripts afford insight into the misunderstandings between men of good will, all of whom ultimately have the good of the University in mind, but whose immediate goals and ideas seemed to be at loggerheads. In compiling this volume, a service to future historians is understood. However, it seems also to serve a purpose today because it provides a forum for candid opinion and, therefore, it should prove useful to contemporaries who have either not known, or have misunderstood, the motives and actions of their peers.

Most of those interviewed also discussed topics of current concern to academic people all across the nation— teacher-course evaluation by students, problems of minority students, organization of professors for collective bargaining, the impact of news coverage On campus troubles, the status of higher education today. The question of the importance of intercollegiate athletics at an institution of higher education serves well to illustrate the range of reactions on this campus; individual assessments of its worth range from the most important public relations tool available to the University to a remnant of the old rah-rah days, golden memories of yesteryear's athletes.

Disparity is certainly not unique to this campus; a university encompasses diversity— of intellectual curiosity, of capacity to envision change, of opinion on what is of value, of races, and of ages. The winds of change blow through all schools nowadays, and people of our faculty, some relative newcomers, others who have been here for many years, expressed awareness of the necessity of change for growth. Spokesmen for racial minority groups spoke Out candidly about what a university should be to fulfill their needs in education and campus life. And one is struck not only by the dedication and enthusiasm of student

government leaders, but by their realistic attitudes and sensitivity to the needs of these minority students, as well as of the general student body and the University as a whole. If desirable changes do occur, if desirable growth is achieved, it will be due in large part to the intellectual awareness, sincerity, and determination of these young people to be heard.

Ruth G. Hilts, Interviewer
University of Nevada, Reno
1972

ALUMNI ASSOCIATION

ROBERT E. McDONOUGH, PRESIDENT

Robert E. McDonough: I'm Robert McDonough. I took over as alumni president in October. The first six months have gone fairly smoothly, I would say. My major goal, of course, is money. This is just my idea. The Alumni Association at the present time, our major project is the Alumni Giving Program. We got in \$36,000 last year, and, of course, I'd always like to beat that and get more money in there. 'Cause to me, with the legislators and the problem with Las Vegas wanting money, I think our major problem is to get money for the University. Of course, we do have some other problems—oh, the different troubles that come up on the campus we always seem to get involved in. And, of course, the executive board is a fairly large group, so we usually come up with diverse ideas on every problem on the campus. We have a lot of "for" and a lot of "against."

Of course, one of the problems that I, personally, think we're having is with community relations. So much of the stuff that goes on at the campus does not get out to the public. And, typical of all of the things that

go on [in] the day, are—the bad always comes out real well, and the good is never heard of. And I think we need more putting the good out than the bad. I really don't know what the answer is.

A PR man, of course, is a lot of money. Of course, as I say, you've got diverse opinions. Now, one person from Elko sent back our Alumni Giving envelope empty, with a copy of [a report of] the Democratic county convention, and where [Professor Eugene K.] Grotegut was elected county chairman. And they were a little bit on the welfare side, the county convention, and all across the top of it was written across, "We don't want to donate to a bunch of liberals like this."

Well, of course, my personal opinion—that's just one excuse to keep from donating money to the University. I don't think it's very significant, but it is one of the problems we have. My personal opinion is that if a professor's willing to go out and help the community by taking a fairly thankless political job like that, more power to him. But we do get the other side.

And, of course—well, like your Black students, that got us a lot of very poor publicity, and yet there's so many things going on that have been real excellent. Now, on one committee I'm on, on the public relations, we've just commended a freshman baseball coach. As he doesn't have a regular schedule, so he's playing the high schools, pretty near all the high schools every week.

Well, now, this is a very good thing for the baseball team, plus the community relations. I mean, the kids on the baseball team up here will know most of the high school kids that are playing baseball. And it's a common ground, and I think it is an excellent way for the freshman coach to get baseball games.

Ruth G Hilts: And prospective players?

Yes, recruiting. It'll help immensely. And, as I say, there's a lot of things like this that can be done in community relations.

And like these talks of the student body president. heard Rick Elmore last night on KOH. It was an interview, and I think he did a good job, and it gave the better side, not just the troubles we have on the campus. Of course, my personal opinion, too, a little bit, I think—just personal, I think it would help if the students would get into this.

And another, just a personal problem, I would say, is that I think, with some of the professors and some of the students, that it would help create a better impression if they were a little more careful in their dress. I mean, we're still an establishment, and it's the Establishment that's got the money that we want them to donate. And I think if instead of tryin' to buck their ways all the time, we could adjust a little bit to them to get on their good side.

The Homecoming was a little bigger, and it ran for about four nights. And they

had one thing—there's usually just a cocktail party on Friday night, and they tried a buffet dinner, which was very well attended and very successful. And Art [Kess] did an excellent job of organizing and running it. And I think he missed his budget by about ten dollars, so I'd say this was an excellent job of management, and also, I think most of the alums were happy with it. I think we decided that a few of the—there was a little bit too much because of the—well, the fact the alums are gettin' older, and they can't take in everything (laughing).

Can you speak to alumni reactions to the resignation of President Miller last fall?

Well, this was a very interesting thing to me. I had just taken over as president, and my phone rang constantly for about two weeks. And I talked to a lot of the alums. The ones that were calling me wanted me to call a meeting immediately, and have a meeting and a big vote in favor of Dr. Miller. And I talked to a few on the other side of the fence, and it looked to me, personally, like all it was going to be was a big hassle, with a lot of alums for and a lot of alums against. And personally, I was in favor of Miller because of the fact that I can't see (unless you've got a replacement) losing a man. I mean, I've worked with oil companies all my life, and I've seen them can the whole crew, but they've got a replacement sittin' right there. And as I asked Mr. Jacobsen, I says, "Who are you going to replace him with?" They didn't know. And I said, "Well, I would say the best thing would be to keep the man there until you find a replacement."

And over a lot of objections, I just ignored the subject for my own personal reasons, plus the fact that I honestly don't think the internal running of the University is a problem of the Alumni Association. Our job is to support the University, good or bad. And this, to me,

was completely up to the Board of Regents, whether to accept it or not. And as I told the ones that wanted the meeting, for them personally to call the regents and express their opinions, but that I didn't think that it was for the good of the school for the alumni to get into this. In fact, one guy was so vehement that I told him I'd appoint him as a committee of one to impeach me [laughing]. But, as I say, I just made that decision because I was fairly new. I don't know whether it was right or wrong, but that was the decision I made, and I stuck by it.

What kind of understanding was there on the part of the alums that you talked to about the Black students' demand for an office and the sit-in, they called it?

Well, of course, this is a national problem, not a local problem, and, of course, the reactions, there again, were—some were all in favor of them, and others were ready to shoot the whole bunch. And, oh, I had dinner at one of Dean Basta's deals with Stan Davis, and it was very, very interesting. But the problem, I think, with the Black situation, all through the country—it's not the University of Nevada—is that they have been wanting integration. Now, suddenly, they want segregation. They don't want integration. This is one of the big problems they had in Vegas, was they wanted integrated high schools, then, suddenly, the next day, they wanted an all-Black high school. As I told Stan Davis, "It's a little tough for everybody to reverse course in the middle of a stream like that." But, as I say, the reaction was very varied. I would say that the majority are—of course, alums are conservatives, and they were of the idea of, "What do those guys have to have an office for? Everybody doesn't have an office, so why should they have to have one?"

And, of course, as I say, my personal opinion is that they should be integrated into the student government, not a separate entity. This is a—well, as I say, they're not after—this wasn't—this was segregation, not integration, that they were battling for. They wanted—I mean, we don't have a white student union, so why should we have a black student union?

Now, of interest to alums always is the athletic program, and there's been much going on this year. And I wondered if you had words to say about that and the new coach.

Well, actually, we're interested, and do get mixed up in it a little bit. But due to the fact that an awful lot of our members are also members of the Booster Club, we have kind of, to a certain extent, let them handle the athletic end of it more; and to a slight extent, we've stayed out of athletics.

That's a separate entity from the Alumni Association?

Yes. Well, it's the Wolfpack Boosters Club, which has done an excellent job, in my estimation, of subsidizing the athletic department. They give about \$45,000 a year, which they get most of from their barbecue every year at the governor's mansion. And we, to a certain extent, have just kind of gone to other fields, figuring they are doing a fairly good job of handling the athletic situation. And, of course, \$45,000 gives them a little bit of power. But we haven't been able to raise that kind of money, for the whole school, even. So we've just kind of abdicated to them in the athletic department.

As I say, we have no specific goals. We'd just like all the money we can get from the alums because we need every bit we can get. Oh, well, of course, restoration of Morrill Hall

is one of the projects. We have always let the alums specify what they want their money to go for. This is just an idea that came up quite a few years ago, and that people would rather donate specifically. Of course, like everybody else, we prefer the unrestricted giving. Then we can—as a board, can put the money where we think it is needed. But if the public wants to donate for a specific thing, we—in fact, what we do, we immediately shift the money to the department or the setup that they want.

In fact, one man donated a hundred dollars to the women's ski team. Well, we couldn't find a women's ski team, so we donated it to the PE department, which handles the women's athletics, and this money will just be there. And if they organize a ski team, the money's there to use.

Do you want to make any kind of a final comment?

Just—donate to the University.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS
PROFESSOR EUGENE K. GROTEGUT, PRESIDENT

Eugene K Grotegut: I'm Professor Eugene Grotegut, in the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, and I am probably one of the first men to volunteer to take on a second year as president of the AAUP. It's usually looked upon as a kind of burden that one puts down after having done one's duty for a full year, but I felt that there was enough progress made in the academic year '70-'71 to allow for another year, bringing some more continuity into the efforts of the organization to be effective on this campus.

But I found that, as one might have expected if one is realistic about human psychology, that effective action oftentimes needs an outside stimulus. And so, in contrast to the year '70-'71, when many Questions arose when the faculty was under fire from many sources, when critical questions of budget and faculty welfare were paramount, that in this year, '71-'72, when the legislature is no longer meeting, when questions that disrupted the campus so much in '70-'71 have receded to a certain extent, that the AAUP was not called upon to do so much. And many of

the projects which I foresaw as reasonable, realistic projects for the ensuing year simply failed to progress at the rate that I would have hoped. [A] project which would have entailed research—an investigation of the relationships, the dynamics of university life, which I had hoped would take shape, simply did not get off the ground. It is not to say we haven't met some needs, I think, on campus. I still feel that many of these problems which I have alluded to could be approached effectively, and [it] may yet come about. But as to our actual accomplishments in the course of this year, I can only point to one significant endeavor, and that has to do with the basic question that arose in the course of Professor James Richardson's problem, in the failure of the regents to confirm his promotion to associate professor.

I think that if Professor Richardson is recorded in this volume of the oral history that he will confirm the fact that it is the AAUP which assisted him in attacking the problem of the integrity of the procedures adopted at this University, and in protecting the

academic freedom and the other professional rights of a member of the faculty. I would say that the successful conclusion of the court case against the regents was due not only to the essential courage and tenacity of Professor Richardson, but in part due likewise to the sense of support, encouragement, and to the financial aid that was extended to him by the American Association of University Professors.

The association feels, I would say, very gratified, of course, that Professor Richardson's First Amendment and Fourteenth Amendment rights were upheld. Though the case was not concluded in court, there was a recognition by the Board of Regents that, indeed, something wrong had taken place in this incident, and that it was rectified through the retroactive promotion of professor Richardson and the granting of the salary that had been missed in that period of time.

We already see signs of an illumination of the whole problem of faculty participation, vigorous participation, in university governance, and in their participation in the political and social life of the community. Other instances have arisen where individual faculty members have been subject to criticism, and even suggested reprimand in similar terms to what Professor Richardson had suffered. And this, now, was apparently quashed simply because of the success of this Richardson case.

Ruth G. Hilts: Do you want to cite specific incidents, or just leave it general?

Because so much of what I have to say is hearsay at this point, I think it would be unwise to actually try to document it in this case. But we have evidence of instances of this sort, and specifically, the Richardson

experience has been alluded to in terms of quashing this, within the [Board of] Regents itself, in terms of not allowing anything of this sort to happen again.

The association has, in a sense, contributed to the beginnings of new efforts on the campus, the beginnings of a new organization. In a way, I think that we can take some credit for it. In the past fall—that is to say the fall of '71—the AMP chapter on the Reno campus invited the state director of the National Education Association to come to campus and to talk to the faculty about alternatives to AAUP in terms of the protection of faculty rights, to explore with the director what added support higher education could get from this national organization, a powerful, effective educational association. Our arrangements unfortunately did not work out, but nevertheless, the representatives from the organization did finally come to campus, and they made contact with responsible faculty, and a chapter of the National Education Association has been established on the campus. And it's not impossible that in the future—I don't foresee it as something in the immediate future—that there may even be a high degree of cooperation between what has been the national AAUP and this National Education Association.

I know they're affiliated with NEA. Is their proper name the National Society for Professors?

That could be. I really don't know. I have the understanding that the National Education Association actually does not yet have a division which is specifically dedicated to higher education (this is supposed to be from some members of the NEA), but that remains to be explored. I intend, myself, to participate in the NEA. I wish to hold in abeyance any judgment of the organization.

I think it may need further experience in the kinds of peculiar problems that face higher education, as opposed to the kinds of problems that they have been able to successfully solve for secondary education. I would like to think that for the next few years, that this campus could support two professional organizations, giving the period of time in which we determine whether or not—or precisely what functions these organizations can fulfill. As I say, it may be possible that they will coalesce and come together to face these problems, or it may be that one will prove superior to the other, or that one will meet certain kinds of problems, while the other will meet another type of problem. And I would hope that we can remain flexible and work together effectively to promote higher education in Nevada.

Perhaps not unrelated to the AAUP activities is the fact that President Miller invited me to participate as a member of his Commission on the Status of Women on this campus. It's been a subject of considerable interest to me for a number of years. My own wife [is] a professional woman, who was, due to circumstances, dependent upon my profession in terms of locality, and so forth. And so this has been the position of women, and their association with university campuses has been something called to my attention quite constantly over the past ten or fifteen years. And then, on top of that, of course, the American Association of University Professors has been concerned with the progress on professional rights of women on the University campus. This has been a very interesting year in that respect.

I think we've gathered a great deal of information. (This would not be the place for this to be discussed; I think that it will be covered in another place.) I think it should be very helpful in pointing up some

inequities, in pointing up the failure of the University perhaps to utilize the energy and the intelligence and the talents of the many women who are either engaged full-time or part-time on our campus, or who have not received employment on this campus. I would look forward to considerable improvement in the treatment of women on this campus, much of which, I suspect, has not been ever very conscious, but the actions of such a commission as this and of other groups on campus-is going to call to our colleagues' conscious attention some of the inequities that I think have prevailed.

I have been asked to perhaps supplement my remarks on the failure of the organization to pursue some projects that were anticipated last school year. I was thinking primarily of such a thing as the problem of really coming to grips with the kind of awkward relationship that oftentimes exists between the board of governors of a university and the university faculty, and students, and so on. It is my contention that the disagreements that arise under such circumstances and in this type of relationship are rarely going to be satisfied, or the problem is rarely going to be solved, by simply the acquisition of power, to find a simple, direct answer. In a sense, this is why I feel, for example, the tendency toward the collective bargaining approach that has been effective in labor is a little inappropriate for university faculty. Because I think, of necessity, if we are to retain our professional integrity as scholars and as teachers, that we must retain our personal integrity and identity. This requires, then, that we not sublimate or subvert our special and particular interests. We have real obstacles to collective action. And I think, all too often, when one must take a very simple position of outright opposition, then what we do is undermine our personal position. Now, it would seem to me that as

men of intellect, and men with analytical skill, that what rather we could do in terms of collective action is to subject the problem to our collective intelligence, and independently, and then cooperatively, work toward the identification of the perimeters of a given problem. In this instance, it is unsatisfactory relationship, on the whole, between faculty and regents. If it were totally satisfactory, we wouldn't have the recurrence of friction.

Now, why does this friction arise? is my question. What is there about the faculty, and what is there about the present Board of Regents that leads to this kind of friction? Now, that is not to say that a creative, productive kind of interrelationship might not exist, which may involve some areas of disagreement. Surely, that's necessary in any progressive and vital process. But I think all too often that the kind of friction that we feel is not productive, but rather destructive to the true benefit of the University.

So what I had had in mind, and what I tried to convince certain colleagues about, was that we might simply form a committee (or a group of men not even in committee form) [to] which we would say, "Here is this problem. What is its nature? What is the extent of it? What are some of the bases for it?" And once we have identified the problem, clarified its various constituent parts, we could then pose the next question which would be, "What might be the solution?"

Now, one can start with two theories. Basically, perhaps some thinking about the nature of faculty needs to be done—its structure, its interrelationship, its interaction. If we could clarify this, perhaps then through education of ourselves and discussion of these things, we could reach perhaps a more proper perspective on the interrelationship of authority of the state, to this body of scholars who must pay allegiance to not only the state,

which pays their salary in part, but also to an international or a national society of scholarship. Here is one area of the problem. The other would be, "All right, what is there about the Board of Regents, and any board of this type, that we could look at and somehow, perhaps, improve so as to allow for a better, dynamic relationship between the two bodies?" And here again, now, may we not ask, for example, "What qualifications should a person have to be a member of the Board of Regents?" "Is it possible that we could ask that more than merely the votes of the general citizenry should be involved here?" Perhaps a regent should have certain credentials. It may be very difficult to come up with what those might be, precisely, but that's the nature of the problem toward which we should look, with an effort to come up with some resolution. Perhaps it is the failure to—for the proper representation on the Board of Regents.

I think that it might be very difficult, for example, to get support for the view that I happen to hold, but I think that it could be demonstrated quite clearly, that if we have to think in economic terms, which, within our governmental structure we are wont to do, that we could point up quite clearly that twenty percent of the budget of the University of Nevada is met by fees which come from students, not from the taxpayers of the state. Would it not be consistent with American democratic precepts to say that the students have twenty percent of the say, in some way be directly connected with twenty percent of the supervision of the University?

One of the findings, for example, a few years ago, in the Eisenhower Commission on Higher Education, was that it could be stated, "Thirty percent of higher education in the United States is subsidized by the faculty of institutions." That was arrived at as a result of computing the kinds of energy, time, training,

et cetera, that represented the faculty's contribution to the university. This, then, in comparison, when set side by side with other areas of our society—in business, in the other professions, et cetera—would allow for a computation of the actual economic value of the faculty's contribution to be thirty percent higher than that which they actually realize in salaries. One could thus say that, basically, the faculty is subsidizing higher education to the tune of some thirty percent.

Well, now, if this is the case, you take the students' twenty percent support, and if you could persuade the rest of society that the faculty is indeed subsidizing education by thirty percent, this means fifty percent. Should we not then share equally in the direction of the University at the highest level? And I think that perhaps if we have the respective recognition of responsibility, the faculty and students recognizing their responsibility to the taxpayers, who are footing fifty percent of the bill, but the taxpayers, in turn, and the legislative authority, [and] administrative authority, recognizing the contribution of the other half of this academic community to the welfare of higher education in this state, then we might stand as equals and discuss our problems with greater effectiveness, because a dialogue which comes out of a relationship of superior to inferior is liable to lead to misunderstandings. And this is simply some of the kinds of thinking.

Now, this kind of problem is something, apparently, as I said before, that is almost too pragmatic for the academic line to approach with a specific objective in mind. Our own peculiar interests lead us down our own specialist ways, rather than focus on a practical problem, theoretically interesting as it may be. There seem to be simply too many obstacles in getting the kind of expertise together to say, "All right, we need

psychologists who will show an interest, we need political scientists, we need social scientists of all kinds, as well as any number of men and women of intelligence and training and analytical capacity, to focus on this, discuss it over a period of time, and then come to some conclusion that could possibly be implemented by whatever means—through persuasion, through political action, and so on."

This is, in a sense, a kind of disappointment, and perhaps it's simply too early for this idea to take shape. This is basically the area where I feel uneasy about looking for simpler answers. I see it's a very complex one. It requires that we use our intelligence to come up with specific answers to specific questions that perhaps are unlike the questions that are asked in other quarters. I don't really feel that we can answer this kind of complex question with the simple answer of the labor unions collective bargaining alone.

One last remark about the AAUP. I think it should be pointed out that it's not always totally concerned with terribly profound and serious problems, that on May—I think it's on May fifth—the AAUP has decided to allow the faculty to participate in Mackay Day. And we are looking forward to a beer bust-barbecue, and we have even gone so far in the spirit of the times to invite our secretarial staff to join us as soon as they can be released from their office duties. And I think that should be fun.

I've been asked, now, to make a few other remarks, perhaps not from merely the standpoint of my office as president of AAUP, but as a relative newcomer, or a returnee, to the University of Nevada, having graduated from here in 1949, and having returned after study and teaching in other universities throughout the country and abroad. Some few remarks on the change in the university, and a look at the present university of Nevada

from a perspective of other campuses may be of value.

I oftentimes find (and I found this going from one school to the other) that each school often, the faculties, and the students, of each school have perhaps a lesser view of themselves than perhaps others would have. I think that's particularly true of provincial universities—and I use that in the literal sense of the word. Oftentimes, in my view, the prestigious university has a much inflated view of its own value. It's rather interesting. If you start looking at the qualifications and the activities of the individual faculty, the productivity of students that are sent out from the university and their contributions to society and to man in general, I find very little relationship between the name of institution and the end result.

I think if one were to look at individual departments in the popular magazines you'll find this department rated as, say, oh, the top in the nation. This is sort of a subjective impression that is arrived at if you poll a bunch of chairmen of departments throughout the country. This is a kind of academic superstition that is attached to name, or the frequency with which the name is heard, or read in books, or on the title page of an article, or whatever. But if you actually know—having taught—well, let's see. I've been intimately involved in the teaching work of five different universities, and if I were to compare the quality of the various departments I have worked in, I think I would get some raised eyebrows. I could speak of firsthand knowledge of the capacities of the teachers, and of the scholarship of colleagues of the past, and colleagues of the present, and the abilities of the student, and the lack of abilities that they might have, from one campus to the other.

Co, for example, I made a rather radical jump at one time from the University of California at Berkeley, to the University of Kentucky. In many respects, the University of Kentucky is not unlike the University of Nevada, in that it serves, basically, a fairly isolated and rural population. And I was struck by the diffidence of the student body and of the faculty of the University of Kentucky. And I think sometimes that happens here. I found—of course, you had a broader range—they fulfilled different functions—the University of California at Berkeley, probably because of the very breadth of, [or] the variety of educational institutions within the state, can focus, can specialize more in a sort of elite student. But basically, that's really the only difference. The lower level of student performance is not quite so low—it's not quite so low at Berkeley, say, as it is here. But on the other hand, the upper level, the upper range of performance of the students is remarkably the same. The A student at the University of Nevada in my classes basically would have been an A student if he had been in my class at Berkeley. The only difference would be I had perhaps fewer F students or D students (or in that range) there than here.

But now, that's another question. We really can't make these straight across comparisons. Though we have no entrance requirements, for example, which Berkeley may have, we have other conditions that affect the performance of our students. I think the University of Nevada occupies a rare position in higher education in this country simply because of its location. You have an extraordinary opportunity for students to go to the University and support themselves by outside work. There simply are not too many universities that are so located as to allow this to happen. So we have, in proportion to, say, Berkeley, or say, at the University of

Kentucky, or the University of Kansas (where I've taught), or UCLA, or the University of Michigan—all of these places where I've had this kind of experience—you simply don't have working students in the same number. And naturally, if you have a twenty percent or a thirty percent ratio of students who are working outside of the University twenty to thirty hours a week, that's going to have an impact; and it's going to contribute, then, in part, to this larger portion of students performing at a lower level.

So on the whole, I really don't see any substantial difference in many of the students. Perhaps at the graduate level—here, I have not had that experience on this campus to the same degree as on the other campuses, where I was involved directly in relatively large graduate programs. “Perhaps there's a difference in this area. I can't speak to that. But at the undergraduate level, a Nevada A student is not significantly different from a California or a Kansas or a Michigan or a Kentucky A student.

And on the whole, I find my relations with students here, the satisfactions I derive in sensing a change that is basically what you'd call “educational” in them as our relationship, our interaction progresses, quite the same as at other places, and with the same degree, I feel, of success and reward.

ASIAN-AMERICAN ALLIANCE

WILLIAM W. OTANI, PRESIDENT

William W. Otani: My name is Bill Otani, and I'm the president of the Asian-American Alliance. This is a newly-formed organization, and is going into the second semester. There has been talk about forming this group for at least a couple years, but this is the first year that we got it off the ground.

One of the reasons for forming this organization was the fact that little was known about the Asian community on this campus, and we felt that there was a need for an organization which could represent the Asian students on this campus, and could look out for their best interests, and also provide an avenue of social interchange, which isn't provided on this campus, particularly for the Asians.

The Asians on this campus are the largest minority. There's roughly—oh, I would estimate maybe a hundred and seventy-five. That's conservative. And those Asians I'm talking about—there are the Asians that are either Chinese-American, Japanese-American, or foreign students that consider themselves Asian. We didn't take the Asians

that were from Pakistan or India, which—many do consider themselves Asians. We were just more or less confining our efforts to the Far Eastern, I guess.

Ruth G. Hilts: Japanese, Chinese, Korean?

And Thais.

As far as foreign students go, the Asians make up the largest percent of foreign students. There are over sixty-six Asian students, and that's just a little over half, I think, of the foreign students.

Looking back at some of the issues of this year, I think that one of the most important was the BSU occupation of the student offices. I think that was—as far as the minorities go on this campus—that was the most beneficial, in that it started up a lot of committees that had been more or less forgotten about—the Human Relations Committee, the Ethnic Studies Committee. These committees, more or less, [had] wilted on the vine. But due to the Black Student Union occupation, these committees suddenly sprang back to life, and

it's kind of surprising that what they've done in this last year, I think, can be directly attributed to the Black Student Union occupation of the office. Well, most of the issues that the Blacks brought up haven't been solved, but at least they more or less had to look at the situation again, and that was important.

I'm tryin' to think of some of the good things that came out of those committees. Like, some of the more important ones are the rebirth of the Ethnic Studies Program, and how [Professor Richard] Siegel (I guess he's the committee chairman) —how he more or less drew up a proposal again, and he was more or less—you know—pressured into submitting it again, and exerted pressure on trying to start it. The Asian Alliance made a point of asking for an Asian-American experience course, you know, a course trying to explain what it's like to be an Asian in this country. And before, on the priorities, it wasn't even mentioned, and we were successful in trying to get it listed as one of our top priorities, as far as ethnic studies go.

Is there now a course offered?

No, it's not a course offered. And the way things are going, I don't know whether it will be. There's talk that it might be started in—let's see, the spring semester of next year, with Dr. Mikawa leading it. He's in the psychology department. He would act as more or less a coordinator, and we'll bring in speakers and things like that, which is a very promising thing—.

It's important in these ethnic courses, I think, that you try to get a minority person to teach them, you see. I mean, many people don't understand why you need a Black professor to teach Black history, or why you would need an Asian to teach Asian-

American experience courses. You see, these minority people have a certain perspective on this situation. They see it as another minority would see it. If we look at history, we see history in the eyes of the conqueror. We see it through the white man's eyes. I hate to use that terminology, but it's true.

Go ahead.

We see it [the] way white Anglo-Saxons see history. I mean, this is a bias that every group has. A Frenchman looks at history through the eyes of a Frenchman, and the Germans the same way, through the eyes of a German. And a white Anglo-Saxon looks at American history through the eyes of a white Anglo-Saxon. And they don't often see the importance of looking at history through other eyes, the [eyes] of the minorities in this country. Because we have a pluralistic society—well, we're trying to have a pluralistic society in this country—and it's important that if you want this pluralism, that you try to look at history from all points of view, not just from one.

This perspective I spoke about is important if you want to get what it really means to be an Asian in this country. It's hard for you to get that feeling. And that's why we would like to have an Asian teach that course just as much as I'm sure the Blacks would like to have a Black teach Black history.

Now, tell me this. Are you foreign-born or American-born?

I was born in Berkeley, and—.

And you still feel as though you're not quite the same as an American-born white kid? You have a different perspective, even though you're American-born, an American citizen?

Well— oh, yes, undoubtedly—. I consider myself an American, so this is my country. I'm patriotic, to a certain extent, because this is my country. But also, I have to look at things from my point of view. I grew up, you know, with my family and within my Asian community, and they have, definitely, a different set of values, a different set of norms, and they stress different things within my community. To name some examples— education is stressed quite highly in a Japanese community, and we learn patience; and perseverance, and determination, you know, have an emphasis—important emphasis placed on them, I should say. And, you know, these things are subconsciously taught to you. It's a part of your—. I don't know—in society, you kinda get different pressures put on you, and you more or less accept those. And like when you grow up in a Japanese community, or any Asian community, you know, there are certain things that are placed upon you. There's a different set of values, and—well, they're maybe not totally different—I mean, there are some variations.

Well, I think it is good to have it part of the record, why you feel slightly different. I'm surprised always to hear an American citizen say he feels like part of a minority. But you've spelled it out. This is good.

Yeah. I mean, I associate with different foods, and— you know—it's hard to explain. It's —Just the whole community is very much different, you know. In the Japanese community, they have their own churches, and they have their own social life. Really, it's a subculture within, you know, a major culture. And that's true of almost all minority groups, that they have certain values. We have to realize that if we want to understand this society as a pluralistic society; we have

to realize that every group is different. Every minority group has its own set of values and its own set of norms.

One more question, and I'll let you just take off on your own. You have, in your group, American-born Asian students and foreign students from the Asian countries. Do you find any quite different values within that group? Do you feel that you're more American? Or they're more foreign?

Well, there is undoubtedly a big difference.

But you feel more homogenous as a group than, say, if you were with a bunch of white students, or American Indians, or if you were a part of the international group?

Yeah. There's—there's a difference. I mean, we consider ourselves, like I said, Americans, most of us, and this is our country, and so we try to change the country, you know. If we see something that we don't like, we like to work and change that aspect; whereas, if you're a foreign student, this isn't your country, you know, and you don't have to get that involved in the political ramifications. That's why it's important that we work together in that we're all Asians, you know. But there's a distinct difference, you know.

Well, I wondered which group you felt more at home with. This was just a personal question.

I guess we feel more at home with the Chinese-Americans, or Japanese-Americans. Yet we're all Asians, and that, right there, gives you a distinct feeling. It's just like the Blacks, you know—the Blacks from Africa, and the Blacks from Chicago, or something like that, they're both Blacks, and they both run into some of the same problems, same kind of

discriminations, and stereotypes, but, you see, the Black born and raised in Chicago might have a totally different idea about the situation than maybe a Black from Kenya. v0 see, this isn't his country, and he can always go back home, and so maybe he doesn't stress the change aspect. He can sit back and suffer for the few years that he's going to be here, whereas the Black man born and raised here would have to. And the same way goes, too, with—you know—with the Asian.

The problems that the Blacks mentioned are really not unique to just the Blacks, and, you know, that's important, to note it. I mean, it's not just the Blacks that were out there—you know, voicing these views. But, you know, they really more or less spoke for the minorities in general, because the problems that the Blacks face more or less are common to all minorities. There's a lot of things going on now that are still important, and I think that they can be attributed to the Blacks.

Just to change the subject a little—I think one of the most critical things that are going on within this University now (I say now—in this month of April) is that the Human Relations Committee is trying to pass an Affirmative Action plan. And this Affirmative Action plan will be a great step forward for this University. I don't like to say this University has been lax, but I think that it hasn't been as progressive as it should be. That's one of the jobs, maybe, of a higher institute of learning, is to be progressive, you know. Because you're turning out, in this institution, leaders in this society, right? I mean, that's what we've been told, anyway. The college graduate is going to be the leader in business, and all this other stuff. Whether it's true or not is something else. But if the University can be progressive, you know, and make these kind of changes which society

needs, I see that society is going to move—progress the way it should. And that's why I think that programs like this Affirmative Action Program, which is, you know, long overdue—I mean, these are required by law, federal law, to have an Affirmative Action Program. And this University hasn't had one. And they know that they're just sitting on borrowed time, and pretty soon the federal government's going to come down here and audit the books.

This Affirmative Action Program says that you will be nondiscriminatory, and you will try to meet the federal requirements, you know, in job hiring, and things like that. And yet this University hasn't come out yet and said that they will try to do this, so as far as things in the future, it's important that we watch that, because that gives you the trend of this University. They tried to pass that two years ago, and it didn't get past the first committee.

Who tried to pass it a couple of years ago? Do you know?

Yeah. It was Robert Jeffers [Director of Personnel Services], I think. He proposed it to the president, I think, and President Miller and he—they put it before the Personnel Advisement Board, or something like that. I really don't know exactly. I'll have to look that up. And like, they turned it down, and they only approved a small portion of it, and it—you know, just died right there on the vine. It's kinda been through mostly that office, the personnel office; they've been working very hard on that, and trying to get going again. And it's been placed before the Faculty Senate.

Well, this is something to look forward to, then, hopefully?

Yeah. If it doesn't pass, that gives you a pretty good idea on how this University looks at the minority situation. In the past, I don't know whether it's been that receptive, you know, to it. I mean, they might say they are, you know, but as far as the programs that have actually come about, there've been so few.

Another point, I think, that should go in the record is the whole thing about ethnic studies. That's another thing that has gone up before this budget, is the funding of an Ethnic Studies Program. I think there is a great need for it. Now, people are going to say, you know, "Why is there a need for an Ethnic Studies Program?" you know. "There's not that many Asians on campus," or, "There's not that many Indians," or, "There's not that many Blacks." But, you see, that's not the whole purpose of an Ethnic Studies Program, and I think that that's really, really important. You see, an Ethnic Studies Program is not just for the Blacks, it's not just for the Asians, it's not just for the native Americans, you see. It's for all the students. It's important that all the students be acquainted with different minorities. And that's why, in a lot of these ethnic studies courses that I have taken, there's been a large percentage of white students in it. And I think that they have gotten just as much out of the courses as some of the minority students.

Maybe the minority students can better relate to them, and undoubtedly, these courses help them; these ethnic studies courses help their identity—their questions of identity—and they're undoubtedly most beneficial to them. But yet I think they're very, very beneficial to all students. And that's why I think it's important that we try to fund an Ethnic Studies Program. But, you see, up 'til recently—well, until now, the University has kicked in very little funds—in fact, almost no funds—for an Ethnic Studies Program, you

know. The Associated Students donated—I think it was \$1,200, or something like that, and then that was matched by the Center [for Religion and Life] with another thousand dollars. And we got two good courses in, ethnic studies courses. These groups, the [ASUN] students and the Center, saw the value of these; they're willing to put their money in, but the University isn't. We always have gotten thrown at us "the budget," and—. It's where you place your priorities, see? And I think that this should be one of the top priorities. President Miller has said that this is one of the top priorities, but it still hasn't been funded. It might be funded now, because this budget has already been in, and I don't know whether it's been approved yet or not. But I hope it is, you know?

Some of the other things that have been going on this year is the expansion of the EOP Program, and I think that's very, very important program, as far as minorities go, and there's also another program called Special Admissions that Pat Miltenberger is trying to get through.

As far as our group, or organization, we think it's really, really important that we become more active, because the Asians on this campus have become very, very passive. They haven't voiced their opinions and views, and I think it's important that we do, because I think that we realize now that the destiny of a minority is going to be created by that minority. If you want something done, you're going to have to do it yourself, because it's not going to be given to you. And we'd wait around—well, 'til hell freezes over for an Ethnic Studies Program. But if we voice our opinion and say, "We want this, and we want this, and we'd like to see this, and we definitely see a need for change," then change is going to come about a lot faster than if we just wait for it. That's why in our group,

the Asian Alliance, we try to sit on a lot of committees, you know. We like to sit in on the Human Relations Committee (that's one), and the Ethnic Studies Committee, and—and Activities Board, and things like that, just to find out what's going on. And I think it's been very beneficial, you know. We've been able to get things that I don't think we otherwise would've.

One of the things that we've done over this past year has been—well, one of the highlights, I should say—has been a New Year's celebration. We had a Chinese New Year celebration, and we had Chinese food, some Japanese food, and some more or less exotic food, and we opened this up to the campus and invited everybody.

How was attendance?

It was fine, and we were really pleased. It was more or less a membership drive, kind of like, thing. And we did get a few people to come, and they were very interested in it. It was mostly for exposure, and public relations. We see the need to work with all factions of this University. But the whole thing—you know, you have to get yourself together, your group together, so we can stand unified and be able to work on issues as a group. And that's mostly what we're doing now.

We just had an encounter a couple of weeks ago. It was a marathon encounter. It went for two days, I guess. And we just sat around, and we talked about what it's like to be an Asian and how we feel about certain things. I think it was very healthy. And it was very, very, very good to have for our group. And that was one of the things that I hope to have more often in the future, those kind of get-togethers.

And we also have just little social things, like in May we're planning to go to Lake Tahoe

for a picnic, and things like that. These are the kind of social things that aren't really offered by the University, that are for the minority students. The Asians on this campus more or less have gone around in a—with no group to associate with. I could be active in—let me see, Blue Keys, or something like that, but you know, still, that's not quite the same as—. You don't feel that—that [mi: Brotherhood feeling?] Yeah. Well, it's hard to explain. You know, if I could put my finger on it, it'd be nice, but I can't. There's always a little sense of uneasiness, and not total acceptance—at least—maybe that's my own view. And I'm sure that it is. I'm sure that there's other groups that the minorities feel totally at home with.

I'm just thinking about some of the things that have gone on, you know, in my life up here at this campus. I was just thinking that when I'm asked whether I'm a foreign student, or something like that, I should say, "What country are you from?" They naturally assume that you're from a foreign country. I mean, there's some people that ask me, like—well, where I was born, and they expect me to be born in some exotic place, you know. And here I am. I'm born in Berkeley, my family's been in this country for four generations. I know that I'm American, but some of the other people, they seem like they don't really quite understand that, you know.

Like, when I talked to the Alumni Association (I was speaking on this ethnic studies thing), it was an interesting thing, that one of the ladies in the audience asked, "Well, why do you think that you should have a special Ethnic Studies Program because if I went to a foreign country, and I'm an American, I wouldn't expect them to incorporate U. . history or American history into their curriculum, because it's their country." In other words, she was sayin to me basically, you know, "Why should you have

an Ethnic Studies Program? This is America, and you have American history.” What she was saying basically is, “If you’re a foreigner, you should not expect to have your peoples’ history in there.” And like, it was very hard for me to understand that, because I don’t consider myself a foreigner.

But you would like to know about Japanese culture and history.

Well, not so much just the Japanese culture, as the Japanese-American culture. I mean, the role that they played in this country is a lot different, you know. I mean their settlement patterns, their migration patterns, the reasons why they came, what kind of problems did they run across—you know. And the same for the Chinese. You know, especially in Nevada, too—because the Chinese, at one time in this state, were very, very numerous. There were a lot that went through with the railroads, with the mining industry, and yet, there’s relatively few now. And when you read about Nevada history, you don’t read about the anti-Chinese riots in Carson City in the 1870’s. They don’t give you those kind of things, like how the Chinese were forced but, and things like that.

And like I know when the Japanese were being shipped to relocation camps and before they got their evacuation notices, [World War II] some of ’em started to go to Nevada. And the governor of Nevada said, “Listen. We don’t want you in this state. If you come to this state, we’re going to put you in concentration camps.” I mean, these are on record. You don’t get that kind of view in a history book.

As I mentioned before, this is a really young organization. I think one of our greatest assets was that we had a Japanese-American in office as Vice President of Finance and Publications, Craig Ihara. And because we were a young

organization, we didn’t know all the ins and outs of starting a group, and how to get funds, and how to go about approaching the whole idea of establishing an organization. And this is where he was very, very helpful. Tie told us the steps to take, and the procedures, and he was very, very instrumental in helping us get funds to operate with, and funds to put on some of our activities.

The UNR athletic program—I think it was Ken [Kenneth J.] Carpenter called for a committee to look into some of the problems that minority Blacks are having with the athletic program, and scholarships, and the whole thing. I think that’s healthy, not—you know—as a minority [personally], actively involved in athletics. I think it’s important that this be looked at, because I can see where the Blacks are deeply involved in this program, and some of them have voiced quite a bit of dissent with it.

Are you personally involved in athletics for UNR?

I’m not really athletically inclined, but I like athletics.

The ASUN constitution, also—that was very interesting. They put in a minority seat. That’s one minority seat. Now, I think that could be attributed to the Black thing [sit-in], also. But the minorities on this campus, we’re trying to get together. We want to work together because we do have common problems. And like, we talked this over. We saw it as maybe not as beneficial as they thought, like they were doing us a favor, or this is to soothe us politically, or something like that. But you see, they gave us one seat, and we’re three minorities, and we all have different problems, and we all have different views and attitudes on it. And like, if they want to represent the minorities, I don’t think

that one seat—. That would be a great way of dividing us. That may be beneficial, but it wouldn't be beneficial to the minorities, I don't think.

A recent group that just started is the Ethnic Coalition. And I hope that the future of this group will be great, because—.

Now, is this a group of many different ethnic groups?

Yeah, it's made up of Chicanos, native Americans, Blacks, and also, Asians. And this group isn't just—it's not a campus organization. It's a community organization, also. We have a lot of minorities from the community come to these meetings. There's a lot of minorities—well, there's not a lot, but there's minorities working in the clubs and in jobs around that this organization can look at. And not only just are they looking at the campus, but they also are looking at other aspects of the community. And I think that's a good sign, I think, to working together. I think any time you can work together with diverse groups such as, you know, the Blacks, and the Chicanos, and the Asians.

You do find common problems and common solutions?

Oh, yeah. Right. I mean, like, we all agree that this Affirmative Action Program is a must, and it has to be passed, and we all agree that—you know, like there's a need for an ethnic studies department, a department. We'd like to see a department on campus which is different than what they have proposed. They want to propose a program, and we would like to have a department, because this program is going to be always subject to financial problems, you know. And we won't have a say in what kind of professors

we get; we won't have a say in the hiring, or what kind of courses we want taught—we, as minorities, I mean. It's going to be decided through the system, you know. And we'd like to—we think that through a department, we'd have a better input, you know. We can get the kind of people that we want, the kind [with] perspective. We could look at the courses through a department and get the kind of perspective we, as a minority, want, rather than the kind of perspective the history department wants, or the kind of perspective the sociology department has. I'm not saying that this is bad or good, but I think it would be most beneficial to us, as minorities.

Well—you know, it's a whole new idea. The Blacks, you know, they might have a Black history course, but if it's taught by someone that just doesn't have any concept of blackness—. I mean, they're not going to see relevance in the course, they're not going to get what they want out of the course. And I think that it is part of this University to be receptive to the needs of the students, and they haven't. I don't think they have been to their fullest extent. The politics comes into it, and I really think that, sometimes, the politics really stifles education. You always have to worry about the budget, or you always have to worry about what the legislature's going to allot you, and you don't want to rock the boat, you know, or they'll cut you off, especially in this state. I mean, the Adamian thing we had was a classic example. The retaliation of the legislature on this campus was felt, and I think that's sad.

Looking at the out-of-state tuition aspect, I think that's very, very critical for the minorities. The whole thing about out-of-state tuition, and the GPA requirements. I know these are going through some big changes now. But a large percentage of our Black students are out-of-state, and there are

Asian students [from] out of state, too, you know. I'm an example of that. And I think, if you raise the out-of-state tuition high enough, or seize tuition wavers, you could pretty well make this an all-white campus, if that's the goal of the University.

They're proposing to do away with it, you know.

That'd be nice. [laughing]

Of course, everybody's tuition would be raised, then. The in-state and out-of-state students would have to pay the same to meet expenses.

They're tryin' to raise the GPA standards, though. [Grade point requirement.] I think Jack Shirley's pushing for that. And sometimes, I think that that could hurt the minorities on this campus.

Going back, looking back on ASUN, sometimes I—well, as a minority, look at that organization and say, "That's not representing me. That's not what I want." The ASUN—the students, I think, they look at it in a different way. They look at it, "Well, let's see what we can get passed," rather than what should be passed, you know. They try to work with the administration, you know. I think they back down to the administration on it lots of times, and don't really look out for the students. Ti mean, this is just a personal bias, I'm sure, on my part, but like, I'm really sometimes upset at the positions that they take. They could really be progressive, and they could ramrod a lot of things through, and really exert a lot of pressure on the administration, a lot more, you see. If they could represent the students, like, say, [about] concerts. I know that there's just been a statement that the administration has said there'll be no more concerts in the bowl or in the gym because—something about too many illegal things going on. T

mean, they're going to sit back and accept that. Now, if it was the kind of student government that I'd want, they wouldn't accept that. They'd go to war over that, [laughing] you know. Because—you know, those things [concerts] are good for the students, all students, and like, I think it's sad that the administration's going to pass down that kind of rulings that are just really going to pretty well cut off the social life of the University here.

I think, since I've been in there the last four years, the social avenues open on this campus have been decreasing sharply, you know. When I was a freshman, they had—you know, dances, and they had a lot of concerts, and they were free concerts, you know. And these things don't exist now. I mean, even the Mackay Day concert they're charging you money for, which; when I was a freshman, it was free.

I don't know whether that's just economics, but to me, it stifles—. Well, it has an effect on the minorities, first, 'cause, you know, many minority students aren't exactly rich. 'Course, that's true of a lot of students, you know—and it's not just minorities. But, you see, that's a good way of cutting out a proportion of the social life. Because I can't afford to go to a rock concert that's going to cost me three bucks, you know. And if I want to take someone, that's going to cost me six, you know. And my budget really can't allow for that kind of expenditures often.

A lot of these things I'm saying to you, I'm sure that they're all my own personal views. And to say that this is how my organization looked at it, I think wouldn't be fair. Because, you know, my group is just as diversified as this campus is. o anything I say, I think should be taken as my personal opinion.

Well, I've mentioned some points that I think this university['s] goals should be, and I'll reiterate a couple of those points.

I think that it's important that we have a pluralism in education, you know, we have an education that's a full education, in that all sides are represented and looked at. A biased education, I think, is almost as bad as no education. You have to be open.

The whole idea of a university, you know, I think should be to expose you to a lot of different things, and that you might not have been getting, you know, [to] make you aware. And the university, to me, is where education really starts. It's no longer forced learning like it is in high school. And they don't have to follow certain guidelines, you know. You can make the educational experience on this campus as much as you want to make it, you know. And like I say, pluralism—that should be the goal of education. You don't slight one thing, you know, for another—from a minority point of view. History [should] give you a view of history from all sides.

As far as the size of this University, and goals, and student body numbers, and stuff like that, I don't see any way that this University is going to keep from growing. Within the last four years there's been many new buildings on this campus—the Chemistry, Lecture, and all the other buildings like that that have been built. And I think there's many, many more that are going to be built in the future. And I think that the administrators are going to have to realize that campus is doing to become bigger. And I think that they're going to have to realize, too, that they're going to have to progress with it; they're going to have to increase a lot of things. They're going to have to increase budgets, they're going to have to increase faculties, they're going to have to increase services that this University offers, you know. In other words, I don't think we can say whether this University should be a small or it should be a big university. I don't think this University has any choice. This University is going to expand.

I like a small university. That's one of the reasons I came here. Being a big university doesn't mean it's going to be, you know, great; and being a small university doesn't mean that it's going to be less than great.

How about the quality of education you're getting here?

Well, quality education, that could be looked at in many ways. It's pretty much what you want to make it, you know. There is a definite need for improvement, as far as quality, in my eyes. I don't think you can ever have enough quality in education, you know. For me, then, quality would be an Ethnic Studies Program, and all these other kind of special fields. Part of quality is if you have an interest, you can expand into that interest within a university. And flexibility, to me, is the sign of a quality institution, and I think sometimes that this University isn't as flexible as it should be—or I would like it to be.

Is it meeting your needs?

Yes. It's meeting some of my needs. It's what I want to make it, too. As far as meeting my needs right now, as in the ethnic studies lines, no, it falls very, very short. And in other fields, too, I think it's not meeting exactly what I would like it to.

Is it preparing you for a vocation, a life work? Or is it simply expanding your mind so that life will mean something to you, more than it might otherwise?

Well, as far as preparing me for a vocation, I really don't know that it's going to do that, you know. But it's undoubtedly expanding my mind, and opening up a lot of new horizons for me, you know. It's going to prepare me

for a vocation in the fact that when I go and apply for a job, or I go looking for a job, I will have, you know, a BA or a BS. I mean, that undoubtedly is preparing you for a job, you know.

And in that respect, I have to say—okay, to an extent, it's preparing you for a job. But don't think that—to say that I'm going to be able to walk into a job and say, "I'm prepared," you know, is wrong, because, you know, you're always going to have to—. In any job, you're going to have to go into their kind of training program, find out what kind of system they have. And, you know, the University's going to give you, basically, a certain kind of an understanding, or general understanding, or a concept on how things work. And so maybe when you go to that company, or you go to work for that organization, you'll at least have some background knowledge. And that's going to prepare you to a certain extent, but I don't know whether it's going to totally prepare you.

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA *DANIEL J. KLAICH, PRESIDENT*

Daniel J. Klaich: I'm Dan Klaich, almost ex-ASUN President. And it's been a funny year. If you start—obviously the good place—at the beginning, why I ever wanted to run, or why I did, it's because I had been in student government actively for two years before I ran, and before that, my sister had been in student government three years actively. And so it always had been a great part of my life here at the University, and I feel that it still is. My running for student body president seemed to be a combination of things. Probably there was an element of ego in it (and I'm sure that everyone has that, if they want to admit it). But there was also a large element—at least at the beginning of the year—that I felt if anything was to be accomplished in student government, it'd have to be done by the student body president. And I felt that if I wanted to do anything in the next year other than sit around, that I'd better be in a position to voice my opinions to people who would listen to [me], and not necessarily out of respect to me or what I was saying,

but out of, if nothing more, a chauvinistic kind of respect for the recognized student leader. And I still feel that. If I have to say something, I think that the student body president's office is a good podium to speak from. You get excellent coverage in all the media.

Ruth G. Hilts: Do you feel it is good, fair coverage?

I think I have got excellent coverage in the media. But that may have something to do with me, because I've lived in Reno for twenty years, and my family for ten years before. And there's a new wave of young broadcasters, and many of them are close personal friends of mine, and my brother's (who's older than me), and my family. And so the people in the media liked me, and I—you know, had a habit of making good news for 'em this year. And so we got along really well. I never felt that the media came down on my head. Sometimes I was upset with things that came out in the papers or the TV, but I—.

What kind of things?

Oh, I realized, once, when we were very early in my term, last April, I said that the funding that goes from students to athletics is obnoxious. And that had been after I was up all night with an initiation for a club I was in. And I realized the next day, when that came out in print, that that was a very poor choice of words. And Steve Toy, who was the campus editor at that time for the Reno Evening Gazette, picked it up because it was such an excellent word for the papers. And so I was kind of upset that that was in there. But—you know, if you say it, there's nothing you can do.

That was my only problem, I think, with the press, is that early in my term, I was really a very brash speaker. I wouldn't measure my words and the effect of what they had to say. And anyone in any position of—you know—notoriety, or trust, or responsibility, should learn to do that very quickly.

I found during the year that it becomes a very thin line between weighing your words carefully and double-talking. you don't want to fool around with people, especially students. Students won't put up with that. And yet, you don't want to be foolish with your words. You just can't afford to do it. And so it's interesting; it's been a good education for me, in that sense.

I started out the year—kinda getting back to my original point—being very idealistic, and thinking that much could be accomplished, thinking that probably students did have some sort of power, or, at least, hoping they did. And I don't know, right now, if I don't believe that, but I think my view has been tempered. I feel very tokenistic at this point.

What do you mean, you feel tokenistic?

Well, I feel that the students on this campus are taken very much for granted, and taken very lightly—by almost everyone. I think one of the most distressing comments that has come to my attention resulted last—when was it?—March, when we were at a regents' meeting down in Las Vegas. A group of Chicano students had come to the regents, asking for Chicano advisors and teachers, and one of the regents commented, "Well, do you really think this necessary? or, "Why is this necessary?" And I felt, well, if you're asked that question, there's no use even continuing the discussion, because if you can't see the need for ethnic identification among minority groups on a campus, there's no use even continuing the discussion. And these minority students went on, and they, in very soft, measured—not harsh tones at all—told the regents that—in effect, you must do this. It's your duty—and it's our civil right, in effect. And a number of the regents remarked after the meeting that, "You students just can't say, 'You must,' because we don't have to do anything, especially for you." And they said that when you come in and say things like, "You must," you can just (in effect) "kiss it off," because it's not going to get done. And this really upset me. I was upset most by the fact that they felt so intrinsically secure in their positions (and they should, because they're very constitutionally protected) that they would feel that no one could say, "You must" to them. And it—this upsets me.

I found this constantly happening in the year. This campus is really the only one I have any real touch with, [but] I'm sure the regents would be just as turned off by me saying that as any Chicano student; and I know they did, when we were talking about the ROTC thing, which was a big disappointment I might get to later.

Go ahead and talk about it.

Well, you see, it was kind of a funny thing. Rob Mastroianni had dedicated his four years of college to getting a voluntary ROTC program on this campus and documented it by just hordes of paper. And it was, to my way of thinking, if you looked at it very logically, sound economically and morally to discontinue mandatory ROTC. And a number of student leaders, including Rob and myself, spoke for it, and in came a battery of gentlemen from the community, war heroes and local military leaders, et cetera, and presented these magnificently emotional appeals, the one exception being General Floyd Edsall. And he went through the whole thing very logically and did not give any emotional plea one way or another. And at the end, the decision by the regents, I'm sure, was swayed by this emotionalism. I remember even, we went to lunch after the meeting, and a number of the men who had come to speak knew me, and we sat down, and they were talking about what a great victory it was, and, "I wonder where the other camp is eating," and it was really kind of funny because it just showed me how their way of thinking was permeated by this whole type of win-lose, emotionalist philosophy, and it kinda really upset me. But—you know—it's no big thing. The ROTC thing on this campus is so minimal that it's not that objectionable to me, except in principle. And the principle of the whole thing upset me.

And so I've kinda come to the conclusion at the end of a year that students are turned to, they are listened to, when it suits the powers' fancy. And when it doesn't suit the powers' fancy, with a limited number of exceptions I think there are some excellent people on this campus. The longer I've been on this campus, the more excellent people I've found. And especially, I respect and believe in [President]

Dr. Miller, both because of the way I think he administers the University (which I don't agree with completely, but it's better than a lot of things I've seen), and because we're personal friends. But the thing is that I just don't feel that students are taken very seriously, and I don't think that there's too many people on this campus that actually believe that for four years of a person's life, this University is everything to them, and that maybe—just maybe—they might have something to say that might be constructive to the running of a university. And they might have something to add that in all your years of education, and Ph.D.-ing, and teaching, and administering, that you possibly hadn't thought of. And I see this, kind of, as a "wildfire" attitude in many people.

You say that the powers-that-be don't take the students seriously enough. How seriously do the students take themselves?

Well, that's a really difficult question for me to answer because I've led two or three lives while I'm here on this University. I have a political life that I lead within the ASUN, and I have a social life, and I have a student life, and I probably have two or three others, depending on which group I'm running with, and they're very distinct, and different personalities. You know—I'm, in effect (and this is not necessarily a compliment to me), many people, a complex person that I don't know if I've quite put together yet. I think the only thing I can say to that is that the students do take themselves very seriously, but there are many different kinds of students running around. And there are so many students that, just frankly, don't give a damn about student government. I don't think they realize the potential power—and power in my mind's not a dirty word. It's a good thing, and it's going

to get stronger and stronger, [but] it takes a unification of the students on this campus. We've got such a diverse student body.

Jack Clarke, over in Counseling and Testing, talked to me—and this is one of the things that's disturbed me all year, and I haven't done anything to ameliorate the problem. I, frankly, don't know what can be done. He taught at an Arizona university before he came here. The campus was about 25,000. And he said that the students on that campus had more of a community feeling and were closer together than our campus of 7,000. And that upsets me because I think, as a small campus, we should have all the benefits of a small campus. By that, I mean not just buildings. We actually have a lovely place here. It's a beautiful place, when you compare it to other universities, even though there are some architectural incongruities [laughing]. We have an urban population here on campus, we have a California population here on campus, and we have a very distinct rural population here on campus, and none of these groups seem to show any great interest in each other.

Do you feel, still, that there's a split in factions on this campus?

Oh, I really do. You only have to talk to people to find it. I've expanded my personal scope a lot this year. A lot of my best friends, now, are what would be anywhere from affectionately, to very derogatorily, termed "cowboys," after this year. And I've spent a lot of weekends at peoples' houses, peoples' ranches, working, and talking to their parents, and there is just a gigantic difference, a chasm, between opinions. And I don't see people working to bridge that gulf.

I think the problem is that there- seems to be very little middle around at this University. People—one thing that they

are very serious about—to get back to your original question—is their opinions. They seem to tenaciously hold to them. And I believe in that. That's good. But if you hold your own opinions so rabidly that you can't listen to anyone else, or talk intelligently with anyone else, you're not going to grow as a person. And also, instead of going through life, hopefully, kind of smoothly, you're going to create sparks with everyone you touch. And I think that's very unhealthy. It's healthy as far as it generates discussion, but I think we've seen at least two or three times this year where that kind of discussion has degenerated almost into violence, and it upsets me.

I have lived in Reno all my life, you know, so I admit very freely that I have a very narrow scope. And yet, with the people I've talked to, and the education I've got from cowboys, and Blacks, and fraternity and sorority people, and off-campus independents, and my own friends from high school, I think that—you know—I've put together a fairly—if nothing else, a fairly representative opinion. I don't see too many people striving to do this, and it's really a job. It's a full-time job if you want to work at broadening yourself.

I think, probably, what the point of your original question was, is, of course, the [ASUN] constitution that went down the drain. That was a big disappointment because myself and a few close friends had spent a lot of time on it. I had some basic ideas, and people that I know that have excellent minds, they were working with me, translated this into a good, strong constitutional language. And this new document that we had "whipped up" filled in a lot of loopholes in student government that exist, plastered a lot of the cracks in the dike. And it was extremely disappointing that it didn't pass—not because it was a personal slap in my face, but because

student government means a lot to me, and I sincerely felt that if this constitution were passed, that student government would run a lot more smoothly.

I think the major thing that the constitution, as we had proposed it (when I say that, I mean myself, Craig Ihara, the current vice president of Finance and Publications, and Bob Fry, who is a good friend of Craig and myself, and has been in student government for quite some time, and Rob Mastroianni, who helped us with the judicial section), eliminated [was] a lot of the duplication of efforts that are presently in student government that are, kind of, the result of the history of student government on this campus in the last five years, from the time when there was an ASUN and a Jot Travis Union Board. These boards performed parallel and very overlapping functions, so sometimes you had two activities on campus, and it would possibly happen that one weekend, that the ASUN and the Jot Travis board would put on a similar activity, or conflicting activities.

And so, under, I believe it was Joe Bell's presidency, a new constitution was written up. And this constitution combined the two organizations, JOTU and ASUN, and created instead one organization that had a Finance Control Board that performed primarily the functions that ASUN had heretofore done, and an Activities Board. These two groups were very, very covetous of their power because they had heretofore been autonomous. And so a vice president was created for activities and for finance control, and each were given allotments, and they kept their own income, and—generally, it was just kind of a messy setup. It meant that you had to keep double books, and things like this, that was, from a pure business, marketing, and management standpoint, a bad business.

What we had hoped to do was to centralize the power and the decision making and the policy making of ASUN in one body, which I made the mistake of continuing to call “the finance control board.” That was a big mistake, simply because there were personalities. As soon as you said “finance control board,” you involved it with the personalities of people that were already on that board. And so, if someone, say, didn't like Craig (who is the chairman of the Finance control Board this year), they might feel very strongly that they should vote against this new constitution because it was his board, and, by God, I don't like him.

What it would have done, in effect, would be to tell the student body that, “If you have a problem of policy, or if you need money, this is where you go, to this one board.” Now, frankly, I don't think many of 'em know where—. “Do I go to Activities Board? Do I go to Finance Control Board? Who makes the decisions?” Or, “If I go to Finance Control Board and I get turned down, maybe I'll go to Activities Board next week.”

And also, it would have forced—by its mere mechanics, it would have forced the ASUN to sit down at the beginning of each fiscal year and budget, entirely, its money, and thereby, set priorities, which it has been accused of never doing—definitely set priorities. “Is a concert more important than a day care center?” “Should Black studies be concerned at all with the ASUN?” “Should we put on classes?” “Should we continue the lecture series, or should we put out five dollars a student for a new union?” These type of things would have to be totally discussed, and you could set up a list of priorities from one to however many.

I was very hopeful about this constitution because I thought it would be good. And I made at least three major mistakes. The

first one was continuing to call the primary decision making board the Finance Control Board. It upset a lot of people. The second one was that many of the powers of ASUN now do not rest with the president, who, I feel, is primarily responsible for its function. And the new constitution vested those powers that he lacked into the president. Basically, the powers were: made him chairman of Finance Control Board, and he isn't now. It gave him a Veto over that board's action. And people were very fearful that I was creating a dictator, which—I don't know—that's their opinion. I personally didn't feel that way, because I felt that we had built many, many checks into the government between the two branches. We had reduced the percentage by which it would take the senate to override a president's veto, and given senate a lot more power. I thought that the checks were more than adequate, but people still objected to this "dictator person" I was creating. And I am, by nature, a very dominant person, and a very self-assured person—at least when I know what I'm talking about. And so I think I came across a little bit too strong when I sold this point. Then the third mistake I made was that I didn't market it properly. [Laughing] I didn't get out publicity in the right places, in the right media. It was printed in total in the Sagebrush twice, and cover-storied once. And the problem that I ran up against is that, instead of printing the whole constitution, we should've taken one page, and in very bold-faced print, spelled out why this was a lot better. It was just really stupid of me, to spend that much time and then blow it on a point that I should've been very well versed in.

But it's something that the new student government can work on, because there are some wrinkles in the constitution, as it was passed by senate, that I didn't like. I

had eliminated dorm seats and Greek seats and off-campus independent seats because I felt that it was kind of, at best, a haphazard distinction. Who is to say that these special interest groups should be represented and that other special interest groups, say, like the Aggies or the minority students, shouldn't be represented? So I felt that the only proper way to distribute the senate seats would be on a population basis within the colleges. That seemed logical to me, in light of the trend of the supreme Court in the last five years on that specific area.

Senate reinstituted these seats, plus adding a minority seat, which I thought was the most tokenistic thing I could possibly think of. They thought that one seat for all the minorities on campus was going to solve a problem. And you have Blacks, Asian-Americans, American Indians, and Mexican-Americans all voting for this one seat, and I can just see the problem if an American Indian was elected to senate for this minority seat. How could he possibly convey the problems that his own people face? [Laughing] It just seemed to me to be such a foolish thing, but senate had, I think, this humanitarian "complex" that, "We're going to institutionalize some sort of minority thing in our government and give ourselves a pat on the back," or something—I don't know. But they—even after admitting that it was very tokenistic—I think they finally came to the conclusion that, "Well, better have a token than nothing at all." I don't know; sometimes I say the same thing, but, in this case, I felt that it was a very foolish thing to do, and I know that it cost many votes because there is a large conservative population on this campus.

When I say "I," you'll have to excuse me because the four of us have worked so closely on this that we all say "I" when we talk about it [laughing]. It's become like a child, or something [laughing].

Why do you blame yourself solely for its losing?

Well, I do, in effect, because I should have been smart enough to pick up these points, and I didn't. And since no one else did, and I let 'em slip by, too—you know—it's just one of those things. I suppose that other people that were very interested in seeing the constitution passed should have picked up these minor points, but they didn't, so—. Well, it's one of those things.

So the constitution was a disappointment. I walk away from the office feeling that I am personally disappointed, but other than that, I feel very sad for the people who remain, because they have to work with this run-down piece of machinery. I suppose that's very conceited of me, to think that something that we have rewritten and created, and has become very much a part of my thinking when I think of ASUN, cannot be wrong, [or] is infallible. I suppose that's conceited, but—it's human nature. I think that if those people that are going to continue on in ASUN want to work with the government that they have—which they, in essence, said—then, that's fine. It's an adequate government. It's not as good as it could be. But it's—it's very adequate.

Do you want to say anything about the BSU occupation of an ASUN office?

Well, I can give you my opinion on that. I suppose that's about all you can ask. I felt that that occupation— while it was deadly serious and very earnest at the time— was kind of a childish thing. During this whole thing— you'll have to understand that when I am confronted with something that I don't necessarily know a lot about, or when I plan my life out myself, I try and think logically. I am a very emotional person, but I try and

objectively think things out. And when I objectively looked at that situation, there was nothing logical about it. And yet, I don't have any specific ties into Black culture or Black heritage. And in my reading since that time, I have become a bit more enlightened on a little bit about what it feels to be black, but I can have no possible idea—. And so I don't know the frustrations and the total lack of congruity in white population that would force them into an illogical situation like that. But to me, it seemed almost asinine.

What was it, just a token protest on their side?

I don't know. There was a very poor channel of communications. When I talked to Stan Davis the day of the occupation, it was getting on towards five o'clock, when there was a deadline, of course, because the offices close up, and they would have to be out. He indicated to me that he never had foreseen the Occupation as going so far. And so I tend to think that the entire events of the day snowballed, not entirely spontaneously, because there was some advance planning. But I think emotions ran away.

A group of Blacks originally came into the office about nine-thirty the morning of October twenty-first. I called from home to talk to my secretary, the ASUN secretary there, and I could hear this rumbling in the background, and she said that I'd better get down there, that there were a number of Blacks in my office, and they said they'd be back at ten o'clock and Klaich better be there. And so at ten o'clock I was sitting there, and I don't know if anybody else was in the office. I can't remember. And these Blacks presented me with more or less a demand that they needed an office. (It seemed kind of foolish to me at the time, but since, I feel more and more that Blacks are alienated on this campus and

need a place to identify with, something that is theirs, and maybe it is an office. I don't know. I think it's got to be much more than an office, hut that is something that time will have to provide for, as well as the administration and the legislature of this state.) They told me that they would be back. After they had demanded an office and walked out, one came back in and said, "We'll be back at noon, and you've got to have an office by then."

Well, evidently, this same group had gone up to President Miller's office earlier in the day and told him that they wanted an office, and he said, "The only place you can get an office is from ASUN President Dan Klaich," and he, realizing, of course, that I had limited control over a very limited amount of space—that is, I could say who occupied which offices in the ASUN. And those offices were already all occupied, those four offices, and so I had no more space. Any other space—and they were basically speaking of space on campus that was available, space in, say, Scrugham Engineering, or other buildings around campus. They didn't realize—or they at least misinterpreted Dr. Miller's remarks—they didn't realize that I couldn't allocate the space. It'd have to be done by the space allocation board, headed by Jack Shirley.

And so they came down to me and demanded an office, and I said, "Well, you know, I don't have any space."

And they said, "Yes, you do. Dr. Miller said you have it."

And so, I was kind of—you know—between a rock and a hard spot [laughing], and I didn't know quite what to do, and they said they'd be back at twelve. And they came back at that time, still wanting an office. And obviously, in that two hours, I had looked around campus, and there was no space. There was no more space at twelve than there was any other time during the summer. There was all

kinds of correspondence brought out between Stan Davis and myself during the course of the next three or four weeks that showed, indeed, that I had said I was looking for an office, and that I'd promised I'd try and find an office, and I, on the other hand, had denials of space from the Space Allocations Board for an ethnic office. There was just no space.

And so what we tentatively agreed on is that, while we were looking for space, that there would be a file cabinet in Craig Ihara's office, and a small working table there (because it's not an immense office) that the Blacks could use. This seemed to be equitable to both sides, and it almost seemed, for a minute there, that there wasn't going to be any problem.

So we went to an office in the back of our little complex to get the file cabinet. And this is the first point that it really dawned on me that there were people that did not want an office, but wanted a confrontation, because we were in my office, and Craig says, "Okay, let's go to the back office and get the file cabinet."

And one young Black shouted, "The back of f ice! Always the back office!"

And it was almost an absurd contention [laughing], and I thought, "Oh, oh, we're for trouble "

So we went back to the infamous "back of f ice" and got this file cabinet. It was the only one that was empty. And it was not really a good cabinet, but it was the best one we had. It lent itself to locks that they wanted, and we were going to put locks on it. At this point, Tex Barrett seemed to be basically in charge, and was really helping us. He was being really, really cool.

We took the file cabinet up to Craig's office, and then the same person who had said the bit about the back office started commenting on what a poor cabinet it was, what a shabby cabinet, and kinda hit it on its side. And at that

point, a few other people hit the cabinet—and noise is always kind of an electric thing. And the emotions were riding high at that time anyway—and someone pushed the cabinet over, and all the drawers slid out. And when Tex pushed the cabinet back up, all the drawers slammed, and there was more noise, and at that point—at that point—I believe, was where the real confrontation began. That was the point where any rational talk ceased. Because at that point, the cabinet was turned over, and Blacks started storming around, and they were talking very roughly at us, and I'm sure we weren't our nicest selves.

They had asked me if anybody else worked in my office, and I said, “yes, there's three people in there. I have two administrative assistants and myself.” We all worked out of my office, and Craig had already offered them his office. And I—[laughing] this is my most slanted point on this whole thing: so my office was no good 'cause too many people already worked in it, and Craig's office had been offered, so they almost magnetically were attracted to, then, vice president of activities Bob Almo's office.

And they all walked into Bob's office (he was sitting there), and they kind of surrounded him. He was sitting on his desk, and he failed to—. This was a key point: he failed to grasp the gravity of the situation immediately, and when they said, “Hey, Bob! Can we use your office?” it was really funny. They called him, instead of Almo, “Alpo.” (And so we called him “Alpo” [a brand of dog food] ever since then [laughing]. it got a kick out of that. Seems there is something funny in all these little tragedies, traumas, whatever they are.)

And Bob says, “Yeah, yeah, you can use my office.”

And as soon as those words were out of his mouth, so was his file cabinet out the door,

and all the papers off his desk. They were thrown in Craig's office. And immediately, at that point, it was their office. The sign was torn off his door, and pictures of Angela Davis were put up on the wall, and it was all very, very quick, as I have come to see that these things of this type usually are.

And Stan—. We went through the day. It drug onto one, two, three o'clock. And, of course, it was right at Homecoming time, and we had this old gentleman [Charles Paul Keyser] that was from the class of 1899 up, and he was having lunch just down the hall, and all the news media were up there, and so all they had to do was turn their cameras around from this old grad to the Black occupation of an office. This is one time where I felt that the news media did hurt us during the year, because, for some reason that's not totally understood by myself, the Blacks did not want to have their pictures taken, and the lights and the cameras incensed them.

So here was the Blacks in the office, and the cameras running, and not anyone, seemingly, Wanting to make a very strong stand. It was a very volatile situation. And it came down to the point where, while I was the ASUN president, and these four offices were occupied by the ASUN, and we paid rent for them, it was I who decided who would be in which office. And if I wanted to say, “Bob Almo, you are not in that office; BSU, you are,” that's fine with the administration of the University. They said that was my prerogative and my power. And so it came to the point where there was no actual abridgment of the law until I said, “You are occupying this office illegally.” At that point, it became a University problem. And that point would have come at five o'clock on October twenty-first, had not some sort of settlement been reached. Around quarter to five, I had notified President Miller and Vice President Anderson

and Dean Barnes what I intended to do. And Chief Malone knew, and various members of, I suppose, the Reno law enforcement community knew, that at five o'clock they would be illegally occupying the office.

Stan [Davis] came to me, and we sat down and talked, and he was upset, understandably, because there were people in there at this point who had ridden in on emotions, and had not really been fully assessed of the consequences, as far as federal aid, scholarships, EOP money. He indicated to me that there were a number of people in there that, or the first time, were going to college, the first of their family to go to college, and how much it meant to their parents, whether or not it meant a great lot to them, and how he didn't want any of the girls that were in there to be hurt.

And this could have been one of two things: either a big line to get me to back away from what I had adopted as a very adamant position, or it could have been a very straightforward plea to me not to do something as equally rash as I believe the Blacks had done earlier in the day. chose not to do something which I considered equally rash, and let them stay in the office for a week while all other sources of office space were sought out.

I think that was a smart decision on my part, and I don't regret it. I think if the situation were reenacted, I probably would have done the same thing. I didn't want a disturbance during Homecoming weekend when there was a "million" grads there, including many regents. It was a time when the situation had been thrust on us so quickly that we didn't have, really, time to weigh our actions, and whereas sometimes very speedy, decisive action is needed, other times, I firmly believe that a quick reaction will sometimes not be the smartest. So in this case, Stan and I chose to buy a little time.

And during that week, we looked for office space for the BSU. Probably at that time, in my mind, I was looking for an office not so much because I was fully in sympathy with the cause, but more than likely because I was wishing to head off a very violent, I thought, and despicable situation that I saw arising. And during that week, we did find alternate office space.

But the problem was compounded past the office in that week at a senate meeting. During the time between October twenty-first and October twenty-seventh, which was the Wednesday night senate meeting, a number of conservative minded people, who have since been branded (laughing) by the media as "the Aggies, the Sundowners, and the fraternity men"—those were the three infamous groups—had become alarmed about what they thought was a very poor handling of a situation that should have been speedily dealt with, and very decisively. (And, of course, [laughing] what they mean is, "You should have brought the cops in right there.") [They] had heard that the Blacks were going to come to the senate meeting on the twenty-seventh and demand that office, demand seats in senate, and—oh, I don't know, there were some other demands floating around—I think it was for Black professors, et cetera.

And so they showed up in force at the senate meeting. On one side of the meeting room were fifty to seventy-five of these so-called "fraternity men, Sundowners, and Aggies," and on the other end of the room, in walked about twenty Blacks. And racial insults were hurled back and forth. There was a lot of, "You dirty niggers!" and, "You niggers don't know what you're doin'," and, "You damn cowboys don't know what it's like, anyway."

I can't—I still can't, to this day, quite imagine how a fight didn't break out at that

meeting. I was glad it didn't, because I was right in the middle of these two (laughing) groups. I can't imagine why hostilities didn't break out that night, but for some reason, they didn't. Something was said to the effect—either at that meeting, or on news the next day by a representative of this group— that, “If you don't get those people out of there, we're goin' to come in and throw 'em out.” That was not the wording at all, 'cause I have heard the tape over and over again. It was a Channel Two tape. I [laughing] recognize it, and I have listened to the tape, and there was nothing of that sort said, but that's the way it was inferred.

And at that point, the office was no longer important. It became a matter of Black pride versus white pride. And, “By damn, they said they were going to throw us out of this office, and they're not going to do it. And we'll stay here, just to show they're not.”

And so the next day, Thursday, rolled around, and alternative office space had been found; but, as I say, at that point, the office was no longer important. And at five o'clock, I, indeed, informed Dr. Miller that the office was being illegally occupied, and I've never seen such a battery of law enforcement people on this campus in my life. I later was informed that there were about a hundred and sixty-two policemen, sheriff's officers, highway patrolmen, plainclothesmen around the campus. I know there were some FBI agents up here. It was just amazing! It was—it was overwhelming!

And the office—the Blacks didn't leave, of course. And somehow, there was this feeling that there were thirty or forty Blacks in that office, whereas there were only fifteen—. Well, no, there were more than that. There were probably around twenty-five. But somehow, someone knew that if you broke down the door into the storage room, there was a ladder

that led to the roof. And about twenty of the Blacks got up the ladder and out on the roof, about half the number that was in there. And the only thing that prevented the rest from getting out was the Mace was shot under the door. And at that point, officers could get in. And, of course, then, they searched the offices, and there were any number of—you know—little weapons, pipes and sticks, and some things. It was—you know, really upsetting to me. But no one was actually hurt.

And then, of course, there were the touchy weeks that followed, wherein Blacks presented their demands, and the case was heard before a student panel. It seems to me, now, that, in reviewing the whole thing, that I'm sitting here and asking myself, “Why?” “Why did the whole thing happen?” If, indeed, the matter was that crucial, why has the cross been dropped? Why are Blacks and whites on this campus now not working with each other to try and move forward to better relations, say, for instance, a better minorities program on this campus?

I think—again, I get very protective about ASUN because I think that there has been nothing done for Blacks or minorities on this campus except by ASUN in this last year. We've sponsored minority culture weeks, we're currently sponsoring the only two ethnic studies classes being offered on this campus. We are going through with plans to remodel a room in the bottom of the Student Services building that could possibly be used as kind of an “international house” (of course, that's up to the decision of the new ASUN officers).

But throughout all this planning, and since those—you know—those last few days of October, and then November, Blacks have been notably absent from the proceedings, even though, you know, we try to involve them. I think that the only answer I can come up with is that the entire incident so totally

alienated them from the campus that they feel there's nothing here, really, to interest them. I think, as far as this campus exists right now, Blacks feel that it's a nonentity. They're discouraging their friends from coming here. They're transferring schools; they're dropping out. That's a tragedy for this University, and no one seems willing, or able, to do anything about it. It's really hard for me to comment past that because I don't know why.

I think the high point of this whole year is when Dr. Miller's resignation was refused. That, to me, was the single time that I can recall during this year that a joint student-faculty plea—and I feel it was basically student motivated because—well, [laughing] again, because I'm selfish—but I feel the students most strongly banded together and showed their support for Dr. Miller. And this was the one time during the year when a direct demand, almost, was made to the Board of Regents, and it was completely listened to. And that is my saving spark. That is the one thing that I can cling to, and I can say—whenever I get really disappointed or despondent or feel like I'm a complete token, I can say, “well, no, Dan, you're not” you know— “maybe you're just imagining it” [laughing]. Yeah, it was probably the one point in the year where, as I say, the Board of Regents listened to us, and acted the way we wanted them to, and that we had planned out, and that we thought was the moral and logical thing to do. And it was also the one time of the year where students really banded together and showed support, students from all different areas of the campus. And that was very, very heartening. That's the kind of thing that this campus needs more of. This campus seems only to come alive when there is some sort of either tragedy or some great emotional issue, which is absurd. If this is the only thing, then you're in for a really boring life.

I think what the students on this campus have to realize is that there's a lot of really beautiful small things going on, and that the most beautiful of these things is other peoples' ideas, and their minds, and what they think, and why they think what they think. And when the time arrives on this campus that students become seriously interested in each other, then, student government will be a very powerful thing, because it will be very united, and people will be interested in working instead of talking, and they'll be interested in accomplishing instead of complaining, and the manpower will be there to get things done. That time hasn't arrived yet. And I'm very hopeful that— you know—it might, sometime soon, although I do see a kind of a decline of interest in student government, as evidenced by the last voting. It was not quite as strong as it was last year.

National trends seem to be indicating that the student power era is now declining, and that students are becoming much more interested with their studies, more time spent in the library, more serious devotion to academics than extracurriculars. And so, maybe what I'm looking for isn't going to come. But I seriously believe that a person can be an excellent student, and also a searching human being. And I think this takes, maybe, a special kind of person. Maybe it takes a person who really wants to work at both of these two objectives, but I seriously believe it can be done. [Laughing] I just don't know. I see a lot of bodies walking around this campus, and all to few people. And, you know, no one—when you're walking around campus—just does little things, like walk on the sidewalk instead of the grass, say hello to people, smile instead of frown, and things like this—I don't know. This is one thing that this year has taught me, personally; I have completely reoriented my thinking, not only because I've been ASUN

president, but it was a very eventful year for me personally, away from my office.

How?

One way or another, just about every member of my family had a close brush with the Hereafter [laughing], so we were all kind of brought to our senses about how nice it is just to be around. And so I've become very upset with the idea of living, and the idea of people—I'm sure you can get that from this tape. I don't think it's hindered my academic growth at all. It hasn't reflected in my grades, vet. And I think it's made me more of a whole person.

To probably answer what you originally indicated would be your last question—that is, what the goal of higher education should be: to educate a person that can move from the university environment into society, and grasp society as a real thing, and somehow, for the better, change it, by good, hard, diligent work. I think if a university creates graduates that matriculate, and four or five years later graduate, and they move Out and they are assimilated into society, it's not fulfilling a function. If they create people that are shoved away into niches, it's not fulfilling any function. What the university should be doing is, it should be training the people that are going to have the foresight, and the technical knowledge, and the ingenuity to keep our society moving forward, and change it. It should be the spawning grounds for a silent revolution, or evolution, of thought and technology. And if it doesn't do this, it's failing, and it's kidding itself. Because if we don't move forward, the entire world's going to run right by us.

I don't know how well the American educational system is accomplishing that goal. Something was recently brought to my attention by a French teacher who I admire

and respect greatly on this campus, and that is, if you will look around in the philosophical area, the international philosophical scene, you will look around, and you measure the great thinkers that have come out in the last fifty years, you're not going to find too many Americans. And if you take this as just one measuring stick of our society, you'll see that something's wrong. And I think this possibly can be traced to the university. We are not training thinkers. We're training—well, what we're doing [is] to get hung up in the computer era—you know. We're keypunching cards to be fed into the computer. That's all we're doing. And when you keypunch a card, you know exactly what it's going to produce. It's not going to be able to produce anything more than you've punched into it, because it can't punch itself, and it can't operate the machine, and so you have nothing more or nothing less than what you have programmed it. If you are a math teacher and you teach me everything you know, but don't teach me how to expand on your theories, you've failed. We need more thinkers. And that's what I think the goal of a university should be. [Laughing] End of sermon.

I think the question of the decade, for me, this last few weeks has been, "Well, are you really glad you're out of office? Are you going to be sad to see it go?" And I say, "Yes and no." It's our old joke over at the AS1JN. Whenever we are talking about anything, someone says, "Well, are you indecisive on that point?" And we say, "Well, yes and no" [laughing].

And so I just think it's been an experience for me that I wouldn't trade for anything. If I were to turn my life back one year, I'd probably run for student body president again. And if I was sufficiently lucky, or unlucky, as the case may be, I might win again. But it's over, and I don't regret it being over. I can't regret it being over because— I think it's almost poetic that

the elections come in the spring. As the new life buds out, we get a new president.

And it's time, because, I'm sure, also, my remarks today have conveyed a bit of a tone of frustration. And the frustration is that to run for the office in the first place, you've got to be motivated to do something. After being in the office a period of time, you realize that what you can actually do, no matter what its merit might be, is very limited. And so, there is what I have termed many "contingent frustrations" with this office. And by the end of a year, those frustrations [laughing] mount up to the point where they permeate your existence. They just—you can't think of anything, really, but these things.

It's tough to sit and think, "God, why? I should be doing something. I shouldn't be answering five hundred memos from people on what student I should appoint to this committee because I know that committee's not doing a damn thing." And yet, if I don't appoint the student, maybe sometime in the future, the committee'll be a working body, and we'll have lost our student representation. So now I decide I'm going to appoint a student, [and] now I can't find one. And it's kind of a vicious cycle. So—that's just one example, of course, [laughing] of your frustrations.

You're going to have to find at least one positive, good feeling out of this year, though.

Oh, the whole thing is a positive, good feeling. It's a—. I can't think of this office in negative terms. It's impossible for me, because for one year, it has been a life for me, what I delineated earlier in the tape as one of my "lives" [laughing]. The office is amazing. It's fantastic. It has taught me more than I ever believed possible, to sit down and objectively look at something, and sort out the wheat from the chaff, or whatever—the good from

the bad— or the emotional from the meat—and to look at a problem and try and dissect it, to find out what the problem is, and try and find a solution. Or, even better yet, it's taught me to try and anticipate a problem, and thereby head off a crisis. And that, for me, has been fantastic!

When I think of being ASUN president, I think of everything that it's done for me. It has made me much more of a person than I ever was, or ever would have been if I didn't take this office. When I tell you I'm happy to be going, it's because I have this overriding feeling that it has been so fantastic for me, I haven't been able to quite feed back into the office an equal amount of "good vibrations," or whatever. I haven't been able to do as much for the student body as they have done for me through that office. And that is kind of a frustrating thing, because I'm the kind of conscience-ridden person that feels that I owe reciprocal feedback to people. If they do something for me, I should be equally good to them. I have come to the realization, now, that with the various limitations put on student government constitutionally, by the administration of this University, by the Regents, by the apathy of students (which is such a tired old phrase I don't even like to say it), and by the student leaders themselves, there are so many restrictions that I feel [it's] impossible to feed back as much as it's given me, and this is a very frustrating thing for me.

So the year is over. It's done. And it started out magnificently, and it's ending with a very good, warm feeling. I know that after I leave office, there'll come a time when I'm between classes, and I have a class, say, at ten and then not another one 'til one, "What do I do? Geez, do I have to go back to studying?" [laughing] "Do I have to remember that, actually, I'm a student after all?"

It will be impossible for me to drop something. I've been in ASUN since April of my freshman year, and to all of a sudden be, if nothing else, institutionally divorced from that, is going to be a good "culture shock" for me [laughing]. It's something that is over, though, and I think, at this point, that I'm smart enough to realize, "It's over." I love it—it's been a good year. I've tried, succeeded in some places and failed in others, been very happy with some solutions and very disappointed with others.

But—that's another thing that it's done for me. I have come to realize much more of what life is all about after this year, because I never personally have been in a financial or emotional strait. I have lived a very comfortable existence, [laughing] for which I'm very thankful to my parents. This year has taught me that life, and more specifically, politics, and the game of interreactions between people, is not a logical game. It's a nasty game; there's back-stabbing, and you lose more often than you win. But if you just remember the losses and don't remember any of the times you've won, pretty soon, you're going to—probably go out and commit suicide, or something, I suppose. It's given me a more realistic outlook on things, and that will be invaluable to me, I'm sure, in my later life. And I think it will probably make me a more useful tool to society, if I ever get that far [laughing].

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF NEVADA JUDICIAL COUNCIL
ROBERT P. MASTROIANNI, CHIEF JUSTICE

Robert Mastroianni: My name is Rob Mastroianni. I'm Chief Justice of the ASUN Judicial Council. This year, the council began with the first year of working under the regents' Rules and Procedures for the University Community. It was previously just a[n] interim rules policy, and this year was the final year that it was codified and put into actual use. It seems that we were [laughing] lucky enough to have virtually every possibility of a case type to be brought before us under this new policy. We had the special hearing, the general hearing, and the University division hearing, which is Judicial Council, itself. In the first part of the year, we did go ahead and have the ASUN Senate establish the ASUN Judicial Council as the body to be called the Division Hearing Committee under the University procedure, so that we would hear all major student disciplinary cases.

The Black Student Union uprising, when they took over the room in Danny's office over there in the union building, was the first chance for the University to use the Special

Hearing. The council was unfortunately excluded from this, as there was something like thirty-two various challenges that the people involved could have exerted, and they used all thirty-two—at least up to thirty-one, I think—to narrow the field down and to get the people that they wanted to sit in on the hearing. Unfortunately, they didn't use them in order, as Stan Davis would have liked them to use them, being that he was not there, present, at the challenging, at all occasions. And the members of the Council were excluded, unfortunately. But the process did work very well. And [President] Miller subsequently did not agree [laughing] on that one.

As far as the council, itself, has been running this year, we've been pretty able to do almost exactly what we've wanted to. This year has been the year for drug cases. In previous years, we've had three drug cases, one two years ago, and two last year. This year we've had three already, and two are pending currently, which is a tremendous increase. And it's also an increase in the responsibility

of the council, in that we are pretty much allowed a free rein in how to handle these. We've been fortunate enough in trying to diminish the type of penalties that are given for various what we call nonvictim offense[s] such as a drug offense. In previous years, as recently as five years ago, a person caught with a can of beer was suspended from this University. As long as two years ago, if you were caught with any amount of marijuana at all, you were suspended, [with] a possibility of being expelled. This year, we've managed to bring that down to probation in most cases, depending, of course, upon the incident; and suspension only in a case where it can be directly proven that the individual involved has been in fact selling or dealing in narcotics.

The council also has been very fortunate to have President Miller's virtually complete cooperation. Of the approximately ten to twelve cases we've handled this year, he has minorly adjusted only two, and taken the council's recommendations at face value on all the rest. In fact, he has, several times, expressed his disagreement with our recommendations, but still gone ahead and accepted them on the premise that students are justified to be able to run their own disciplinary matters, and that they should, in fact, be respected as such, and their recommendations and opinions should be followed.

The council has also this year handled several cases involving the use of force or violence, which we, as a council, have felt to be the most important type of cases that we are faced with. Primarily, these cases have resulted with Black students on this campus, which is unfortunate, in that it at times paints a picture of the council as being a body that is—being without a member of the Black race on the council—a body that is adjudicating members of the Black race from a position of superiority, which we, at all times, try not

to do. In fact, we have made a very concerted effort to change this in that we have, for next year's council, managed to have the senate elect [one] who we felt is a very, very qualified man, who is also Black— Stan Davis.

The problem with the force and violence cases arose pretty much from what I feel are growing discrimination problems between the Black race on campus and the University authorities, and that those conditions that arose around the BSU occupation have not been corrected, and many Black people on this campus feel that they are going to have to do something of their own now. And this type of militancy has been on the increase, as reflected in some of the cases that we have had.

The council this year was also faced with several constitutional interpretations of the ASUN constitution. We've tried to make these, as far as possible, just strict constitutional interpretations, following what we feel to be the intent of the writers, and not to rely, as we could, upon our own intent of what we wish would happen. We've, instead, done straight interpretations, and in our body of the work that we then write up for the senate, we include recommendations on how we feel a better system might be legislated. In this manner, we feel that we've been able to stay away from the student politics angle and actually delineate more what is meant by constitutional government here at the University.

As for my own work this year, I've been quite involved for the last four years in ROTC, in trying to make it a voluntary program on campus. This year we decided to pretty much try and get all the material together for a final run at the regents. Last year we were stymied on several occasions by the Military Affairs Board, which failed to meet except for the last two months of the year. And at those

times, the meetings were virtually restricted to students, the important meeting was, in that the student members of the board did not receive notification of the meeting at which the board passed its recommendation that ROTC remain mandatory until after the meeting had taken place. We, therefore, brought this in front of the Academic Standards Committee and virtually every other committee of power in the University, and did receive from every other committee except the Military Affairs Board a very positive statement of the need for a voluntary ROTC program.

We took this to a student poll in January of last year to determine what the percentage of the student body requesting a voluntary ROTC program was, and the faculty also took it to a Class A action, and in both cases, the percentages were nearly eighty percent or better, favoring the voluntary ROTC program.

So then, during the summer, we codified all the information from past years. (This has been a struggle that's been going on at the University for, oh, at least on to six years now, that I can remember.) We got all the material together, and presented it to president Miller, who did promise, then, to bring it in front of the regents, which [he] did, I believe, in either November or December. Maybe it was October, but I'm not sure.

Anyway, we brought it in front of the regents with, in fact, what was Colonel Hill's positive approval of the action, which he had vocally given many of us, and which turned out to be what I would not consider a virtual lie, which is unfortunate, 'cause I had a great deal of respect for the man up to that time. We had worked with the ROTC department for the last year in attempting to arrive at a program that would make ROTC voluntary on campus, but would still keep a viable ROTC program functioning. Colonel Hill had given us recommendations as to what

he felt would be necessary before he would approve such a program. We had, in effect, satisfied all his recommendations, and gone overboard, pretty much, in trying to find out exactly what he wanted so that we wouldn't have any problem with the regents.

So then, under the assumption that we had, then, satisfied the ROTC department with our program and our proposal, we went before the regents and were met with VFW past presidents, past ROTC presidents—anybody that was even slightly connected with the military in Nevada. I think they had the Adjutant General for Nevada there. They all gave very rhetorical, dogmatic speeches on why the program should be kept here on campus, and the regents in effect virtually ignored the written material and men in committees that had studied the question, and did go ahead and pass, with a vote of seven to two, the proposal that ROTC remain mandatory. This is a victory of one vote over four years ago, when it was eight to one. [Laughing] So four years of work, and we finally got one vote out of it.

Ruth G. Hilts: There are eleven members of the Board of Regents. Did some members abstain from the vote on ROTC?

No, not all were there. There were only nine.

The reasons they gave were, again, that they felt that the nation should be supplied with officers, through college, to remain a power in the western hemisphere and the world, and that they felt it was their responsibility to give their—I think their exact words were “give every university man the opportunity to participate in the ROTC program.” They didn't grasp our desires that they realize that this opportunity was not, in fact, an opportunity, but a requirement, and

it had very little at all connection with the educational pursuits that a man would come up here to the University to develop.

In the future, we would hope that we may again bring this proposal before the regents, but we are unfortunately met with a time delay here. The last proposal took nearly two and a half years to reach the Board of Regents. I sit on the Academic Standards Committee, as well as the ROTC Military Affairs Board, and I know how hard it is to get any type of measures through the Military Affairs Board, primarily being that it's virtually a protective board rather than an actual board concerned with delineating changes to be made in the program. So we've made recommendations to President Miller that he does dissolve this board and make it more representative of the University for the reasons that any proposal that reaches the Academic Standards Committee, which is a board that's more representative, must go first through the Military Standards Board if it is to affect the military. This is because of a federal regulation that says that a military man must sit on any committee that decides policy for federal ROTC programs. This is why we feel we need more representative people on that board, so that we can move our programs through faster.

We were able, towards the end of this year—it hasn't passed all the committees yet, but it's passed the major committees—to develop a program of exemptions from the ROTC program, which does broaden the exemptions now available, makes 4-F's, ministers, conscientious objectors, and people who have passed the age of military induction not subject to the University's requirement for ROTC. We hope, in subsequent committees, to expand this also, to include I-Y's, and I-H's, and people who have just filed the form for conscientious objectorship with their local

draft boards. In this way, we would then hope to reevaluate the purpose of the program so that in the future, when we bring it in front of the regents, we can show them that the people that are seriously subject to military service, those with numbers under, say, 200, or so, are, in fact, the ones that will avail themselves to the program, and that there is no need, from a military-national aspect, or from a university-education aspect, to force this program upon other people, and that in fact fit, should be voluntary for those who do need it.

This year, with the ASUN constitution, the council, itself, probably is the most obvious point of discrepancy with the constitution, in that under the new rules and policies that the regents passed last summer, the Judicial Council, itself, does not even exist. The referrals board that the ASUN constitution refers to does not exist. The policies and methods of procedure that the ASUN constitution refers to as to be used by the Judicial Council cannot be effectively used within the system that the regents have set up. So we have followed the regents' system and been outside the ASUN constitution pretty much from necessity in all except constitutional interpretations, which are directly subject to the rules set up in the constitution.

So, with this in mind, I helped rewrite the ASUN constitution, which went in front of the students at the general election held in April. The problems arose in that I feel Mr. Klaich, the ASUN president, was very lax in putting this in front of the students, publishing it, getting the publicity he needs. My section of the constitution was ready in October. He and Craig Ihara promised to have it ready before Christmas, after Christmas, and then at least a month before elections. And they just kept postponing it. And this is one of the reasons I feel it was defeated.

There's very good reason to change the constitution, and I feel that it's going to be very difficult to do this unless Rick Elmore, as the new president, is able to drum up enough support to hold a general election before April of '73, next year, which will be very difficult, owing to the degree of turnout that has been shown in other previous elections.

The major changes in the constitution that we hope to move for is a reconciliation of the executive board to eliminate one vice president and put all the money under one board, so that the budget for ASUN can be set up and exactly stipulated before [the] school year starts. In this manner, we'll know exactly how much funds are left, then, for the senate to appropriate to specific programs that they feel are needed at this time. Examples would be a child care center, money to open the library further hours, money that could have gone to court action, legal action against the regents [for] withdrawal of the athletic fee from the ASUN fee, court action that could have been used in defending the voluntary rights to an ROTC course in downtown courts. All these could've been programs that the ASUN could have advanced had they had sufficient funds and knowledge of sufficient funds previous to the year beginning.

We also tried to reduce the number of senators, nearly by a half, and to open positions for senators—what we call representative senators—that would be nominated by the senate the year before they took office, to hold such positions as fit at the time, such as—current positions, examples would be an ecology-oriented senator, a minority group senator, a women's lib senator, this type of thing, so that we could have a minority group representation in senate besides just at-large senators.

And then, besides the living groups and the college groups, which we felt weren't—we

weren't really able to point to any one senator as being representative of any specific group, just because of the nature of the college. We hope to open up the entire ASUN senatorial-electoralship to senators at large, rather than senators representing any group, which they actually never represented much, anyway.

Also, we hope to clean up a lot of the messy wording in the ASUN constitution, which has given the council several difficult interpretations as to what the actual intent of the meaning was over the last several years. We do hope that this goes and passes—at least [laughing] by next year, eventually.

One of the biggest successes I feel that ASUN has helped this University gain, as far as university rule, has been this year, with the fight to keep President Miller in office. He was forced—virtually forced—to offer his resignation because two regents, Morris and Steninger, who, down in Vegas—I forget the month—but while they were down in Vegas at the Vegas meeting, made some really deleterious comments directly to President Miller, about his use of the committee system—mainly about his use of the committee system here on the UNR campus. President Miller has been a president who has felt the need to make decisions through committees, rather than to hand edicts down from the president's chair. The whole University has been very happy with this type of situation, if not in its swiftness, with its ability to have all members of the University community participate in the decisions. Therefore, when these two regents, Steninger and Morris, did make these attacks on President Miller, and the Vegas papers subsequently blew it out of proportion, and then the Reno papers got hold of that, and virtually before Miller knew anything about it, the papers had already committed him to having offered his resignation already, which

he hadn't. And with the various phone calls he received over that week about what was going on, and all the publicity, he did, then, go ahead and feel that there was a need to offer his resignation with the intention of either gaining support of the regents, or if, indeed, he did not have the support of the regents, to resign.

The ASUN and the University community then got into the act and wrote letters, talked to all the regents, went on TV, and succeeded in getting two or three excellent editorials in the papers, some very good news coverage downtown, and when we finally did go to the regents' meeting, the vote was two to eight, in favor of not accepting President Miller's resignation.

Personally, I feel that this was a gain not only for the University in handling its own affairs, but also a gain in showing the regents that we will desire the opportunity to govern ourselves, and that we will not tolerate regents' intervention more than we feel is justified. There's many, many occasions when we feel that their intervention has not been justified. But this was a case that was so obviously acute that the members of the University stepped in and routed the community to an effort to show the regents that the University is, in fact, a nearly autonomous body, and desires its own government and decision making powers. I think that's one of the better successes we had here this year.

As I was saying before, I also sit on the Academic Standards Committee. This committee is primarily interested with reviewing the University in the use of academic policies, such as new courses, new colleges (one of the proposals was for an honors college this year), programs that change the policy of the University as far as registration, keeping students in school, funding, financing, this kind of a thing.

The two major issues that we were faced with this year— one we lost, and one we won—were grading and an EOP program to admit special students. The ASUN sponsored the grading proposal. It came out of the ASUN Senate, went to the Academic Standards Committee, where it was abridged, with the approval of ASUN Senate, to basically take the policy of grading away from a punitive aspect and put it into one of delineating a student's successes here at school. The policy was set up by several changes in the present grading system to show what a student succeeded at, and not, rather, what he failed at.

Anyway, the proposal went through the Academic Standards Committee with a unanimous vote—I think it was unanimous; I'm pretty sure it was a unanimous vote—favoring this type of policy change. The specific changes were in the repeat policy, where a student would be allowed to repeat a course now without having the previous grade averaged in, but rather, receiving the grade that he got the second time through, which would show his expertise in the subject, rather than that he'd failed it before. The "withdraw-failing" system was abridged to allow a student, who, through emotional reasons or just deciding to drop out of school, had left school without properly withdrawing, or had just gone to a class and not actually taken part in the class, and left the class after the limiting period for withdrawal. It would allow a teacher to give a grade of W, rather than being forced to give the student withdraw-failing. And the third change was in the method of assigning satisfactory-unsatisfactory grades, in that we asked that the teacher, himself, be allowed to do this, being that there had been a discrepancy between teachers and the registrar's office, in that the registrar's office marked D-F as unsatisfactory, and A-B-C as satisfactory, and the general University faculty

had understood that a D was passing, and not failing, which the unsatisfactory grade was making it, in effect.

So anyway, we sent these up to the Undergraduate Council, which has final authority on this type of matter, and were roundly defeated, in that they hit us ideologically, and said that they did not approve of the policy that we were professing. They said that they wanted a student who had failed a course to, indeed, receive punishment in the aspect of grading, or being forced to take that course over again with a deleterious mark on his GPA for it. The only part that they did pass was the withdraw-failing. They allowed students to, then, get a W grade in a class. There was quite heated discussion on this for a while, but it did squeak through the committee.

We were pretty much amazed at this. We're still going to fight it, I'm sure, in that we had hoped that the philosophies of this University were changing toward more of an open educational atmosphere, rather than one of authoritarian-punitive-type setup.

The second proposal that came through Academic Standards that was passed, both through Academic Standards and the Undergraduate Council, and will subsequently go to the regents (which we feel it should be approved there; it's hard judging the [laughing] regents beforehand, but it should make it), was one that was jointly proposed by the EOP people and the Human Relations Board, to establish a special admissions program here at the University. The need for this was two-fold, in that there is not a special admissions policy here at all to admit students who are deficient in either high school grade point, or ACT scores, through any number of circumstances, such as, oh, economic disabilities from their family, or emotional handicaps, people who had just returned

from the military, people who had not gone to college for several years and wished to return—all types of people in this manner were—there was no program to admit them to the University. The second reason was that the federal people had exhibited a certain disappointment with the University's policy of having no special admittance for people that were specifically funded through federal programs, to receive monies, that the University had no ability to admit them.

Anyway, the program was, then, proposed and passed to make provision to allow up to fifty students to be admitted on a special admittance program, which would last a year probationally, and then they would be instated in full in the University. This, I feel, is one great success that the ASUN has also helped accomplish here this year.

As far as the athletic program goes, I think it's beginning to become apparent in virtually everyone's eyes that the athletic program here at the University needs a complete revamping [laughing]. The system exhibits discrepancies, particularly in their budgeting, and in their inability to do anything with the teams they get. The money is going to the teams that are losing, and the teams that we have on the University that are very capable of excellent showing, such as the tennis team and the ski team, are receiving virtually nothing of the amounts of monies that are going into the University athletics. I also feel that in the near future, ASUN will probably sponsor some type of legal action against the regents to recover the seven-fifty per student that the regents withdrew from the ASUN funds. There has been action of this sort brought forward at Washington University earlier this year, and I'm not sure if it's culminated yet, but the prospects then were that it stood an excellent chance of being won for the students.

We have several university people, most notably Jon Wellingshoff [Vice President of Finance last year], who was interested in this, and who still bears an interest. He's at Washington, D. C. right now, and has been, through outside channels, exerting a great deal of force in the issue to go ahead and bring this before a court for some type of ruling.

And I think that's about all, as far as the University.

At this point, I'll just go in to talking a little bit about where I feel American education is heading, and what I hope it is heading into. The classes I have had the last two years—I'm not sure if they're representative of the whole of the University, but the classes I've had, especially through the Honors Board, have been most fortunate, in that they have examined pretty much in detail the quality of education, and actually, different methods of education and how they might be used and to what advantage, as well as several of the classes participating in new, model forms of education, classroom form, themselves.

What I feel, pretty much, is that the authoritarian type of education that arose through the Dewey system that has been around for who knows how long, at least a hundred years here in America, will give way to the open classroom, the situation where the students, themselves, will volunteer what they desire to study, and with the hopes that they will become more innovative, more self-discerning, more concerned, and less apathetic, less of the form "to sit and receive information," and more of the form of actively going out and searching for it.

The educational system as it is now almost frightens me, now that I've studied it. When I think of sitting in a classroom in elementary school or junior high school, being bored, and having a teacher stand up

there (who's] bored, and trying to force-feed material into students, there're untold problems that can arise from this type of teaching, especially in the technological age we're approaching. The use of teaching machines, and some very sophisticated uses of methods to gain attention, the use of drugs (which has already taken place in schools) to control how a student acts—I feel, if this type of authoritarian education continues, these methods will virtually eliminate any type of self-expression or any type of innovative, self-expressed student. These methods that I'm talking about will, I feel, go ahead and just completely destroy man's ability for self-expression in that they are not teaching a person to learn or to gain knowledge. They are teaching him to assimilate dogma—doctrine that has already been established. They are allowing, in effect, people who rise to power to exert their force virtually without any chance of retribution from the general populace.

Examples of this would be—methods are currently available to allow an instructor to indoctrinate a student in methodology to that student's not only liking, but complete malaise concerning his situation in being indoctrinated. I mean, the student would not even care that he's being force-fed. There are methods that can be established that the student would enjoy being force-fed, and this method— these methods of education—if continued, could very well establish this type of a general subpopulace or a subculture in America, that of the basic people, the people that receive this indoctrination, and that of a more elite, nearly Fascist type of government.

Now, you've read about this as pertaining to the secondary schools and the primary schools. Have you felt that any of this kind of education is fostered by universities?

Well, going on to that, I think the university is not the place where these new methods should start, such methods as are ascribed by Paul Goodman, and (Alexander Sutherland] A. S. Neill, the open classroom methods, methods of teaching that, in effect, do not demand of a student that he perform competitively with his peers, but rather that he march to his own drum, that he proceed at the rate he feels best, and in the direction he feels best. At least the instructor, then, is more of a guide, a resource person to best help a student by indicating where the material he seeks should be found. These type of methods have begun to appear in colleges, and even in some of our grammar schools and elementary schools in the United States. Most notably, North Dakota and Wyoming have quite large open classroom programs now. They're still in the experimental stage.

The problem here is that once the student has gone through twelve years of education, through grammar school and the secondary schools, high school, it's very difficult for a student, then, to be thrown into a college atmosphere where the teacher says, "Go ahead and find it yourself." This is a problem that many teachers on the honors boards have found when they try and open a classroom up to letting the students dictate the program and decide what will be done, how it will be done. They find that nothing gets done because the students are used to authoritative direction, and it's difficult for them to work without it.

The problem should be addressed, as A. S. Neill has said, in that, you must have faith that the people will, in fact, be capable of self-learning. So far, you know, a semester doesn't give you a lot of time to have that type of faith. It needs to begin down the educational ladder, with the grammar schools and more elementary schools. This is where I feel modern education is heading. I know that I

won't send my sons and daughters to a public school. I'll send them to schools, the private schools, that my friends are going to build because they believe in free education and an open-type classroom. And they don't believe in browbeating a student into learning math and geometry when they're five years old through ten, when they could be doing other things that get them interested in learning, rather than get them interested in pleasing a teacher or pleasing an authoritarian. This is where I hope education will be carrying itself.

And with this type of education I feel the United States will breed the type of man that will be useful in the future, and that the times have passed where industrial age automatons are needed to stand at assembly lines and turn screws, the same dull task over and over again. The time has come where some people have said the man of the future will be most preoccupied with art and learning, and not with earning a living, as such, that technology will have advanced to a point where the base tasks are taken care of by machines, and there is enough for everybody, and that the more higher forms of human function are by then able to be effected by all people. So I think this is where education is going. I hope so. The methods of getting there, I feel it's—it's going to take as much on the students' part to force the teachers to allow them to approach their own goals and their own desires, as it will on the teachers' parts to show the students that he can do it.

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA SENATE *RICHARD L. ELMORE, PRESIDENT*

Richard Elmore: I'm Richard Elmore, and I served during the last year as president of the ASUN Student Senate, and I'm also the newly elected student body president for the coming year.

Perhaps the best way to examine my last year in office would be to take a look at some of the events and problems that we have faced, as far as student government was concerned, during the last year. There are several obvious problems and several that were not so obvious. A good example, the BSU problem and its relationship to ASUN and student government. There were a lot more problems involved, as far as the BSU is concerned, beyond the simple request for an office space on campus. I think that the "fight" for an office, so to speak, was merely a way to bring to surface a lot of deep-down feelings. It was kind of a summation of a lot of social problems, problems that students typically feel on campus—all students—perhaps amplified to a certain degree because of the racial—you know, [the racial] minority [over] tones.

It's interesting. To me, the whole BSU problem was merely a way of getting to us in student government and pointing out that perhaps we've forgotten people on campus. I think what they were saying to us was, specifically, that we had forgotten them. At the same time, it made me look around and look at a lot of the other groups of people who I put on an equal basis—and pretty effective, as far as I'm concerned, because—you know, I really started to realize some of the problems about forgotten people, and being lost in an academic atmosphere, and the way the thing can get away from you, if you're not careful. The office, again, was merely a way to bring the thing to a head. It was a cause to point up all of these problems, and some of the research that we in student government did, and I, personally, did, after the events, and talking to many of the students about what was going on, feeling that there were problems that the students—all students—were facing, that we in student government had failed to look at.

If you go back to the Black thing, you get academic problems; these may be social

problems—or socially-started problems—which, you know, culminate when they get into an academic atmosphere, which you encounter on campus. We were told at times—and I really think that we can believe it—about the competition [for] status of minority people. Getting into the university system is really a degree of fairness, as far as entrants into a university are concerned. Are our minority students on an equal basis [with] students who are nonminority students?

Ruth G. Hilts: Do you mean academic basis from the high school from which they graduated?

Right. Essentially, that sort of thing. If you Want to get it down to specifics, you could say that they would tell you that there is not a fair basis for competition. The individual in a high school, say, Reno High School, or a Nevada high school, cannot really be placed on the same level as a Black individual or a minority individual who is a product of the ghetto, you know, in some large city. Many universities across the nation are making an effort to encourage minority students to get into the universities.

By making special standards for them?

Right, special considerations, as far as entrance in[to] the universities.

Now, I don't think at this time that there's been this sort of trend on our campus. But you do have the problem that many of the kids, minority students who came here, are from poor areas. We've got a couple students, you know, from Washington, D. C., who grew up in highly black, poor neighborhoods, in run-down schools where there would be reason to question the quality of precollege education that they got. This is one of the things that they were pointing Out.

Have the other minorities spoken of this, too, like the Indian kids, or the Asian-Americans, or—?

The Indians, I think. The Asians, I really don't know that much about. I in conversations with Indian students, and discussions about some of their problems, they seem to point at this sort of a thing, that you're really at a nonequal level when you start, you know, that perhaps minority students are at a disadvantage upon entrance into the University. And this puts them a step behind, you know, from the very beginning, and it's pretty hard to pick up the distance in time to get out.

Another thing that, to me, seemed really important— we, as far as athletes go—you know, make no bones that we've got a recruitment program going, and that we encourage certain individuals to come to school here to fill the ranks of our athletic teams. And one of the things that we heard during all of this was that it seems that people were given some kind of a "dreamland impression" about the University of Nevada, and what it was, as they were recruited. Then when they got on campus, you know, found an atmosphere that was quite different, and felt that this was a disadvantage, too. we were told—and I don't, you know, know whether or not this is exactly what was said or not—but cases where individuals were told that, for instance, in the Reno area there was adequate housing, that students would be able to find a place to live, or could come with their families and find a place to live in the community; that there were adequate jobs for students in the Reno area, and that you could—you know, if you had to work part time that your chances were pretty good of doing this sort of thing; that Reno was a place that was receptive to minority elements. And this sort of thought,

that the University would take care of you, would recognize your weaknesses and would help you through the system.

They really were told all this? This is what they told you that they were told?

Right. And then, you know, on campus, [they] found a very poor housing situation, not only from a minority standpoint, but from a total student standpoint, even beyond that. It's hard for anyone to find housing in the community, let alone a student, or specifically, a minority student.

Employment—it's really tough to come up with any kind of full-time job, let alone part-time jobs, where you could work a little bit while you went to school. Again, they seem to feel that the University forgot them once they got them on campus, and they felt more or less trapped as far as staying here. They've made the move, their families were here—you know, wives and children. When they moved from certain areas of the country, you know, or came here, made the commitments, you know, contractwise, to be on the athletic teams, and found something quite different, this led to a great deal of frustration. And immediately, the feeling that nobody cares about you, that nobody's thinking about you, starts to multiply. And it's instant trouble. I think it's important that you feel and that you know, when you're in an academic atmosphere, that there are people who care. This is important anywhere, you know. It means a lot to know that there's somebody there to help you along the way. I think that these people felt that they had to kind of become disassociated from the University, and really felt no connection other than the daily duties of going to class, or going to practice, you know. That was the connection that they felt. So we were hit with this.

And then, you know, you've got the other considerations to make where this whole problem was concerned—social problems, [and] Black problems being pointed out as a national trend now. And a lot of these things were swept into the trouble that erupted as far as this campus is concerned.

Now, you students that I've spoken to in student government seem so truly aware of the problems of the minorities, even though you've been criticized, and misunderstood, perhaps, by the kids who feel alienated. how is the general student body reacting? Do you feel that because you are in student government and get hit with the problems that you're more aware and sensitive to them?

Well, that's a good question. You tend to learn real fast about something that you're immediately confronted with. I think most of the students, you know, have their own thoughts, which they've based upon what they know, large or small amounts of knowledge that they have where the issue is concerned. Apathy is certainly a major problem on this campus. I think that the kids have got very strong feelings one way or another, but are just, you know, apathetic to the point of not feeling the desire to make the expression or to come and talk about it.

So you've got this problem, and you're kind of limited to the number of people that you can talk to on a one-to-one basis, you know. It's better if people feel like they can come and talk to you. But this isn't the attitude that exists on campus now, certainly, this is one of the things that I'm hoping to strive for during the next year, is a little more association, as far as these people, to student government and to ASUN. Again, knowing that there are people there who do care about your problems on campus—if you can do that,

if you help people, that's the most important thing. Communication is so important, and when you don't have communication, the chances of you having trouble or problems goes up, you know, extremely fast. You know, here again, I think this was all pointed out, as far as this whole thing was concerned. And I'm the first to admit that we had extremely poor communication, as far as the Blacks were concerned.

This was during the sit-in?

This was before the sit-in. And I think, you know, that this thing happening on campus is what precipitated the ultimate seizure of the office. These people could feel that we weren't communicating, and somehow we were blind to the problem until we were confronted with it. It's changed a lot of attitudes.

You know, it's an overall campus problem. The Blacks are an extremely tight-knit group—or were an extremely tight-knit group on campus—and they had a cause, and they had a close group to bring it to the surface, and were able to do it. But as far as forgotten groups and forgotten people on campus, I think there are thousands of other students who've been just as neglected—at least by ASUN—as the Blacks were. It's just that they don't have the closeness and the organization to really point it out. So, realizing that we've forgotten minority students on campus, I think we've got to realize that we've forgotten these other people, and make an effort to correct that situation.

Another thing that came up this year that I consider to be a top issue, and very closely related to the Black problem, was the resignation of President Miller. There seemed to be a feeling—at least among a few of the members of the Board of Regents—that Miller had bungled the problem, as far as the

Blacks. Certainly, the University was highly criticized for the Governor's Day events from the year before, and the hassle over Paul Adamian, you know, and the instructor that was involved in Governor's Day. President Miller had a few marks against him where regents were concerned from those events, and then the Black thing came out, and, you know, we "had more problems on campus." And I think this one, you know, brought the resignation about, or at least the feeling, as far as Dr. Miller was concerned, that [he] didn't have the confidence of the Board of Regents, which is an extremely important thing.

Here again, I think when the students got involved in the situation—and particularly the Black students, who were to a large degree responsible for what was happening—went to bat for Dr. Miller, we got the problem taken care of. Other than the two members of the Board of Regents who voted against him, I think he had a strong showing of confidence from the board, as a whole. If anything, the resignation of President Miller brought—at least as far as one issue is concerned—a lot of students on campus together behind one cause in an effort to keep him, and to keep his attitudes and his policies as they've been established in the years since he's been here. I think students realize the necessity and the importance of due process where a man and his position are concerned, and that the action by a few regents was rather arbitrary, and one not based on a lot of reason, reacting to the public's feeling that Miller was responsible for all of these problems, which was, you know, probably not wholly the case. At any rate, the students did jell together, together with alumni and faculty people who know Dr. Miller, and they know what he stands for, and pulled the thing off. And I think it was a great, great thing for student government. If anything else, it showed us at least what we

have the potential to do, if we could get the students together on things.

Other issues of the last year—these are more directly related to student government, rather than the whole University—an attempt was made during the last year to establish a new constitution for the associated students [ASUN] on campus. And as you may know, it met with a rather smashing defeat, largely due, if not solely due, to apathy on campus. The voter turnout for the new constitution was extremely small, and came nowhere near to the number necessary to pass the thing. Here, again, I think we're pointing out a great many problems on campus, and this defeat of the constitution has shown me several things about the student population. This made me ask why people have no interest, and, you know, what were the reasons that the constitution failed.

Do you have any personal theories on why it failed to excite interest?

You get back to the relevance of ASUN to the student population. Students on campus, I think typically the last couple years, have been growing away from student government, and have really felt no association to it, and therefore, a constitution representing that student government meant nothing to them. They've gotten by without the system for a period of time now, and they could get by for a period of time in the future without any association to student government.

Another problem with the constitution was the kind of "rush" atmosphere, as far as getting it passed. It was presented rather late in the year, as far as the term of office, and there was this kind of feeling amongst the people in student government who were doing the work on it, and the people who had to present it to the students, that there was a

great deal of pressure and rush behind the thing to get it passed, so that it—the effect it had on the new elections—could, in a sense, go into effect. There were major changes as far as the composition of senate, and the size of senate, and some adjustment in the executive branch of ASUN. And the executive officers during the last year wanted to get the new constitution through in time for the new election, so that these adjustments could, you know, come into effect this year.

When the thing was presented to senate for approval, which is a necessary item to obtain, the senators, you know, brought up a great many questions about the constitution, and there was, you know, considerable disagreement as to how different sections should be arranged. Representation, and how the composition of senate was going to be made, how the elections were going to affect the respective colleges, and what sort of representation these colleges were going to end up with afterwards. Everybody seemed to have their own little plan—you know—apportionment plan, as far as senate was concerned. And the last couple of meetings, we went great hours into the night, you know, a debate, trying to come up with something that everybody would agree on. But there was this constant push, knowing that you were on a limited time basis, that you had to have it done by next Tuesday, or next Wednesday, because that would be the deadline for getting it into an election, a special election, for the students. And a lot of people, when the final plan was agreed on, although it did get the necessary approval from senate, people weren't really behind the constitution, and they weren't sure that it was the best policy.

Whose idea was it that there should be just one seat to represent minority groups? That was a stumbling block, wasn't it?

Well, certainly, the minority seat issue was a big one—you know, how much representation do we give minority students?

And how you elect him?

Right. What sort of a criteria do you establish to choose a minority senator? In commenting on -this, it's extremely hard. You have a minority seat to give representation to these people. And, for instance, say that you establish the seat and say that it's going to be a minority seat, and you want minority students to elect it. So the criteria that you establish is that only non-Caucasian students can vote as far as the senate seat is concerned. Well, you've just reversed, in a sense, the discrimination. Instead of the typical form, you know, white discriminating against a minority, you now have the white students saying that they should have just as much right to vote for this person as anyone else. And there're all kinds of constitutional ramifications about the legality of doing something like this.

So the status of a minority seat was extremely shaky, in how you're going to choose the person, how you're going to get a good person to represent, to take the interest, to get involved in student government.

Because the Blacks and the Indians and the foreign students and the Asians would all have different problems—.

Right.

—And none of them would be satisfied with one representative.

Exactly. You know, how do you give, in this case, four minority seats, saying that there are eighty Blacks on campus, and they get one representative. And there are three

hundred and twenty nursing students, or something to that effect, and therefore, they should have, you know, four representatives. And then you get up into the area of the College of Arts and Science, which is two thousand students, say, and you end up giving them thirty representatives, or some high number, like twenty representatives, and pretty soon you've got a monstrous senate. And this is one of the things we wanted to work towards, was reducing the number of people in student government. There are thirty-five people in the senate now, and the plan was to cut that number down to somewhere around twenty, eliminating fifteen seats. So how do you come up with an equitable distribution, a ratio of representation, to a specific number of students without, you know, again, making the body extremely big.

Certainly all these problems were problems that weren't going to be cured in the course of two weeks, which is essentially the time that we worked on the constitution. And when it came to election time, I don't think the constitution had the confidence of the people who had passed it (the senators). And I would say that there was a great failure on the part of senators and other people to push for students to get out and vote, and show why a new constitution would be good. They took it with kind of a blase attitude.

Is it going to be an issue in the coming year? Will it be worked over and brought up for a vote again?

We're looking at the constitution right now. And one of the things that I intend to do is make the presentation to Senate and let them work it over, probably in the early months of the fall. And hopefully, right after we get back from break, we could again

attempt a special election, and this would give us plenty of time to run out the problems, and plenty of time to set up some good publicity on what it does and the effect that it will have on the students. And hopefully, this will be enough to get the thing through, because I think the new constitution, or at least some major changes in the existing constitution, are badly needed right now.

As I mentioned, the BSU problem and the constitution certainly pointed up the problem of apathy on campus among students. And to me, this is one of the more nonobvious problems. It's hard to put your thumb on apathy. What is apathy? How do you measure it? How do you define it, you know.

Or even what causes it. Are they so busy with their studies?

Well, you know, this is something that you'd have to think. Typically, when you think of young people, the "now" generation, so to speak, you think of a highly involved pool of people. Young people seem to be into everything, you know, national issues, state and local issues, but you come right around to the University and student government on the University, and you find noninvolvement, essentially. It really makes you think. Definite problem.

As I pointed out, there was just really no interest (in) a new constitution. Kids really felt no effect from the old constitution. So why worry about a new one? And I guess it's possible on campus to get by for four or five years, and really feel—and maybe even not want—any effect from a government that controls you while you're in that time span. So you've got people with noninterest, you know, people who really don't care, who probably never will care, or are here mainly to go to school and to get out and get a job.

Does this apathy stem from a belief on their part that a student government really doesn't influence the school in some way? Students are always yelling that they want school made relevant to their needs. Don't they feel that ASUN can do this?

A good point. I think the apathy has swallowed a great many people who before were extremely active (because of this sort of feeling). A lot of students really question ability of student government to do anything for them. They view the Board of Regents as being all-powerful, and whatever decision is made, the board is what everyone at the University is going to have to comply with. And this is true to a certain extent, you know.

Do you feel you are listened to by the Board of Regents?

Well, what do you mean by my being listened to [by] the Board of Regents? Do you measure it by the number of victories that you bring home from the Board of Regents, or is there, you know, a win with merely the fact that they listened to your argument, whether or not they voted in support of you?

I would say either one is important, if you felt you were listened to.

Right. Many students, I think, feel it's necessary for the agreement on the issue with a student viewpoint. Well, I think this is important [to be listened to], but a lot of students feel that that's really an unimportant thing, that student government is merely a token way of saying, "We are giving you a say in the policies that concern you." But yet, students don't really have an actual voice in what's going on. This isn't contained only in the regents' action. I think, to a certain

degree, administrative policy on campus, from the president's office on down, there's been friction in the past where students have questioned the ability of student government to have any effect on policies made by the administration.

How do you feel? Do you feel you've been making an impact in the last two, three, or four years?

I do. I have some strong feelings about this. You know, students have been included in most committees, and there is a great deal of student representation. A lot of the problems, I think, exist with the students, themselves, in failing to meet the responsibilities of positions that they've had. Many of the committees on campus where students do have a voice meet without ever having students present because the students just, you know, don't go to meetings. It points out a great deal of responsibility, and I don't know how you command much respect from the administration or anyone else when you fail to meet the basic necessities, as far as your obligation is concerned, which is, at least, attendance to the meetings that you're involved with. So I think this sort of points up, again, some of the apathy problems on campus, this sort of attitude about the relationship of student government to the administration not being effective, plus the group of students who come to school and that's all—you know, pay the fees to ASUN and really could care less how it's spent, you know. All they're interested in is the class aspect, and getting the piece of paper, and getting out, to get a job. And you're talking about a great many people.

Maybe another reason for apathy is the fact that you've got, oh, rather a large pool of students who live away from the University,

you know, live in the community of Reno. And it's pretty hard to reach this group of people with very much, other than like concerts, and that. And that's the only association that they ever feel to student government, and therefore, don't care much. They think about it maybe when they get the discount on their ticket to go see a show at the Coliseum, but as far as ASUN being able to help them with any of the other problems that they experience, they don't, you know, measure that situation for what it could be.

Is this student apathy an outgrowth of the growth of campus?

When you've got a thousand students to work with, you know a lot more people. You're a lot closer. It's a lot easier to put a handle on a thousand people. But when you're talking about six thousand people, the diversity is so much greater, and it's really hard to get a grasp on that sort of thing. You have trouble—it's a lot harder to reach seven thousand students than it is a thousand. It's a lot harder to show any relevance to seven thousand rather than one. So I think, you know, that certainly this is a consideration, that you get lost in numbers, and, you know, you don't feel as close as you would if you were a smaller group.

A couple other problems that we might talk about that I encountered during the last year, areas of major concern of students—one is the athletic program as it exists on this campus right now. Students for the most part, I think, are highly dissatisfied with the type of athletic program that they're being presented with. Students keep saying to me that there's a great deal of misappropriation, or lack of accountability, where athletics are concerned, that the emphasis is being placed where the emphasis shouldn't be placed—at least from a student's standpoint.

They don't care about the big team, "rah-rah, we must win" any more?

Oh, I think those days are gone on college campuses, and smaller things seem to be important. Everybody's got their own thing from an athletic standpoint. Before, where football and basketball were everybody's sport to watch, that was your involvement, you know, going to the games and getting behind the team. And now, rather than do that, you're a skier on weekends, and that's your association to athletics; or you're a tennis player, or you're a wrestler, or a baseball player, or a track star, you know, right on down the line.

One of the biggest problems is that students pay for a good portion of the athletic department through fees that they pay at registration, and yet are given no real say in how the program is going to be set up. You can realize that there are students on boards which make recommendations concerning the budget, but that's exactly what they are, recommendations. And I think that most of the students on campus realize this. They really don't have any direct say any more in where the money should go. And I think if they did, the emphasis would be different.

A great deal of the support [for intercollegiate athletics], monetarily, comes from a lot of the old-time football players and basketball players from this campus, whose golden days on campus were spent, you know, every Saturday on the grid iron, before a capacity crowd of roaring fans. You've got a lot of these people that are firmly entrenched in a theory, or at least a thought, about athletics that's pretty well entrenched into our program. And students, you know, are disagreeing. Many people feel that the fee that is paid merely provides for a season's ticket to all of the athletic events. Students

tend to look at the fee as money paid to meet their athletic needs while they're on campus, and this does not necessarily mean from a spectator standpoint. If they want to ski on the ski team, the money that they pay should be applied to that sort of thing, [or] if they are a tennis player. But as it stands right now, this sort of thing does not exist on campus. The money in the last year (little over a year) has been taken out of student controls, and the people who are making the decisions are people who are some of the old-timers, so to speak, you know, "yesteryear athletics," as I call on this campus. They're really not willing to look at today's situation on campus. We seem to be forfeiting smaller sports, whether they're excellent or poor, for the sake of major sports, which, in some cases, are definitely what you could consider poor. And this has, you know, bred a lot of dissension with students on campus.

How about the girls? They come up with fifty cents out of seven-fifty.

[Fifty cents] to meet their needs, athletic needs, on campus, and to me, this is tragic. Realizing that there is not near the area of women's intercollegiate athletics yet on this campus, it certainly would be considered on a smaller scale than men's, but you've got all kinds of women's recreation associations—WRA, on campus—which is starving for funds to provide athletic and recreational programs for girls, not getting any money. And, you know, each of these girls pay[s] a fee, and consider [s] that money being paid to get some athletic or recreational benefit while they're in college, and yet are told that, you know, "It's a season's ticket" sort of thing. You know, "We'll meet your recreation needs, and you can go to the basketball game on Tuesday night, and that'll be enough." During

the campaign for the presidency, this is one of the things that I commented upon.

But here again, you know, how much accountability is there, and how equitable is the distribution of funds? Is it more important that the money be divided equally amongst the elements of campus? (Student money we're talking about now.) Is it more important to have that, or is it more important to have a basketball team which has won something like five games and lost well over forty in the last two years? Students would tell you that it's the equitable distribution, and the provision that programs for involvement be established. They're not getting this from the athletic department. This is one of the things we'll be working at, again, during the next year, hopefully establishing some definite place where students will, you know, be able to get their two cents in.

They're not concerned [with] whatever the Boosters want to do with their money. We really don't care how that money's spent. If the Boosters choose to have it spent on football, and that, that's fine, or on basketball, that is fine, also. But as far as the approximately \$73,000 a year that students contribute, you know, they'd like to say, "We'd like more money in the tennis program this year," or in the skiing program, something to this effect.

Another thing that we worked on during this past year was we tried to establish an effective teacher-course evaluation to evaluate instructors on campus, and the colleges and departments. I certainly have a great many questions to ask about the effectiveness of a teacher-course evaluation. My own experience in my particular college is that—that I really doubt the effectiveness. I think it's important to some professors, you know, how students judge them at the end of a course, and they really look at what was said and try and make changes and corrections to make it

better for the student, perhaps easier for the student to pick up what's being put down. But there are just as many instructors on campus who really will have nothing to do with the teacher-course evaluation, don't care what the students think, and are, you know, heavily committed to going about in their own set pattern. People that I've had— instructors that I have right now— have this attitude, you know. I've had instructors who I would love to make an evaluation on, and not have to hand [it] back to the instructor, you know, perhaps give [it] to somebody else (and I sense that a great many other students in these classes feel the same way), like to the department head, or even as far as the dean of a college, say, or perhaps even beyond that.

I think one of the downfalls of teacher-course evaluation during this last year was that it was kind of a voluntary thing. The teachers who submitted to an evaluation are probably excellent teachers, and they have really nothing to worry about in evaluation. But instructors who, you know, would be concerned and don't want the students to have the chance to point out problems, don't submit to the evaluation. If an instructor wanted to give the evaluation, he could. But if he didn't want to, he didn't have to. The College of Engineering, for instance, said that it had its own evaluation system, and therefore was not going to get involved with this new teacher-course evaluation.

Well, I'm in the College of Engineering, and there have been classes in the past that I've never had the chance to evaluate. And to me, this is tragic, and it's a great downfall, as far as an effective teacher-course evaluation goes. Students tend to view it in this manner, and I think a great many of the faculty do, too. The good guy, who has nothing to worry about, is a good teacher, you know, doesn't care if he's evaluated, and therefore allows it,

and gets a good evaluation. And what you end up with at the end is a brilliant-looking faculty because all of the faculty people that submit are good. The ones that you'd like to get to are the ones that hesitate about doing this sort of thing. And this is the Sort of attitude that's prevailed among students. This seems to be the prevailing attitude of all the people that I've talked to. Students have raised questions about professors in the past, and they told 'em to wait, and you can have the chance to make the evaluation during teacher-course evaluation, and have come since the evaluation was done, and those professors didn't—didn't pass out the forms, you know, and allow [themselves] to be evaluated.

To me, this is directly involved with sort of a theory of higher education, and the ability of a student to effectively judge his teachers. Do you view the purpose of a university as being one of transmission of thoughts from one person, one being the instructor, to a group of beings, the students? Or is it a—you know, a different sort of relationship, sort of an exchange, a growing of both parties, with the instructor being there as the stimulus, you know, to develop the student's mind? I think there would be great debate about this across the University, certainly probably a diversity of opinion where individual faculty members are concerned.

I tend to view the role of the University as more the stimulus thing—getting into an environment, you know, with, oh, the bank of knowledge being there, and the University providing the individuals who can get this information out. And then you have the students, on the other hand, who accept this information, evaluate it, you know, toss it over, accept it, reject it, question it, strengthen it, in a close relationship with the faculty. And it's a growing relationship. And this is the way I view the purpose of the University—not as

being one of handing somebody knowledge, so to speak, on a platter and saying, you know, "This is what you're to learn. These are the requirements." I see it as somebody who knows how to make a presentation, effectively getting it from their head into a group of other heads, and then, you know, the interaction taking place. But, you know, here again, you're talking about *theories* of higher education.

Well, this is your idea of the ideal, then, this dynamic situation. How does this compare with what exists on this campus, from your experience?

Well, I think it's a person-to-person thing, and it depends upon the student, and it depends upon the instructor. Even in the technical background that I'm involved in, due to my specific college, I found that with various instructors, it's not merely a cookbook thing. It's a sharing of thoughts, you know, and a building of ideals and principles as to what's going on. You know, I accept things because I believe that that's the way they are, not because somebody has said that—you know, the book says they should be this way. Other instructors, I meet with more or less total rejection because I feel like I'm getting something crammed down my throat. The numbers and the facts might be there, but as far as the theory and the presentation of the thing, you find it hard to swallow. From an overall campus outlook, I really don't know.

This isn't Utopia, by any means. And realizing that you've got this fault, and realizing that maybe not everybody accepts this theory about education, you know. Some people may feel that it's the purpose of the University to really equip the student with the tools necessary to get "the position" in society. Certainly, there's been a question about this.

I've never heard the tools defined, however.

That's true, you know. You're talking about a world of definitions. Some people might view, you know—whether you have the tools or not by your ability to effectively assume a position in society, you know. Can you apply what you got at the University? Or could you have gotten, you know, the position without the time you spent there? But to me, it's a lot more. I view the time spent at the University as, you know, invaluable, mainly because it's a learning and growing process—you know, the stimulus on one's mind, a prod to make you want to learn more.

Maybe it would be handy to look at the different parts of ASUN government, and look a little bit at the relationship[s] to one another, and maybe I'll throw in a few comments on how I think the system will have to be in order to effectively work.

As you may or may not know, we have three parts to the ASUN government, the legislative (which is the student senate), the executive (which is the student body president and two vice presidents), and a judicial (which is composed of what they call "judicial council," a panel of five students who hear disciplinary cases, as far as students are concerned, make recommendations as to penalties, and that, to the president of the University).

The Judicial Council is very much its own entity in student government. It's, you know, to handle, like I said, largely disciplinary cases, and really has no direct bearing on the legislative process of student government, so to speak. However, the other two elements of student government, I think, are highly related.

One of the problems this last year was that I think there was a great gap between the executive branch and the legislative

branch—very little cooperation between the two, very little stimulus from one body to the other, you know, as far as getting programs going, and getting things going, so to speak. The executive branch did its thing, and the legislative branch did its thing, you know; and somehow, you ended at the end of the year with the realization that they were kind of pulling against each other, rather than pulling student government forward.

I'm a strong believer in each branch retaining its own individual identity. However, I think you have to have a great deal of communication and coordination of the two groups. Like any other effective system of government, I think, the basic proposals and ideas start in the executive standpoint, to a large degree. This is where the first ideas come about, and the realization of a need on campus. And there's a translation of this into the legislative branch, where, hopefully, you'll come up with the solutions to the problems as they exist in the proposals to best accomplish, you know, meeting these needs.

During the last year, [there were] some definite problems in this effect; and realizing the power of the executive position, and the ability to be able to just take care of things within the office, so to speak, you know, problems, as they came up, were handled within the executive branch, rather than being turned over to the legislative branch for their involvement. Now, if you do this, you get yourself into trouble because you've now got one person, or three people, so to speak, doing the work for seven thousand students, or five thousand students, rather than the elected body, which is most representative—you know, thirty-five senators doing the work on the thing and coming up with proposals. And this got us in trouble. I think there is a definite place within the legislative system for the creation of programs and the citing of

needs, and problem areas, and ways to help the students on campus, Within the senate, you know. I think you've got to hold the executive branch responsible for the largest part of this, and then the creation, again, of the proposals in the legislative [branch]. They go hand in hand. The legislative is a check on the executive, the executive's a check on the legislative. Some strong problems, and maybe we'd get back to the students again. You know, student government is going to have to work effectively, itself, before the students are going to feel any great confidence in it. If you see all the entities of ASUN pulling against one another, you probably doubt the ability for them to be very effective or to get too much done. Now we're getting, you know, right back to the apathy thing again.

You feel you have to have a strong president who creates ideas, but he should turn it over to the senate to implement the ideas?

Essentially, yes. I think the reasons for the president just to pinpoint problems, you know, to be responsible for the citing of areas of concern on campus, hopefully with the legislative branch developing the solutions and the programs to remedy these problems. And here again, you do have the kind of exchange, too, the times that the president is going to be the one to come up with the legislation to handle the problem, and, you know, be going to senate with it. And senate, by the same token, will be citing the problem, so to speak.

But there's got to be a great deal of coordination and Unity of effort where this is concerned. You know, the right hand has to know what the left hand is doing all the time. Certainly, this is one of the things that I'm going to strive for in the coming year.

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA SENATE
*LAURIE ALBRIGHT, SENIOR WOMEN'S
SENATOR, FINANCE AND PUBLICATIONS*

Laurie Albright: I'm Laurie Albright. I was recently elected vice president of Finance and Publications for the ASUN government. This past year I served as an BA in White Pine Hall. BA is a resident assistant, sort of a counselor, an older person in a dorm, who should try to maintain a level of stability, perhaps, try to create a situation where students have an opportunity to learn and to grow.

A lot of interesting things happened in the dorm this year which I find really interesting. I've lived in a dorm for four years now, one year as an BA. I saw things a lot differently as an BA, also as a senior, as compared to being a younger student. It was interesting to me to see how many of the students changed throughout the year. When they came, they were naive, they were afraid, their parents brought them, there was the big problem of getting everything moved in; but as we progressed through the year, say, through October and November, and December, and now, especially through the spring, they've changed a lot. They're more open, they seem

to be enjoying school more. They're enjoying being students, and being independent men and women.

The dorm's a coed dorm, so there's men and women. There's three floors of men, and one floor of women, which is really interesting, too. It's no longer the stuffy, one-sex dorm. There's a lot of problems with the coed dorm—perhaps I shouldn't say problems. I'll just say things are a little different with a coed dorm because you have people from both sex[es]. It's a more real type of atmosphere; it's not lopsided—. It's just that people have a chance to interact, and situations are more lifelike, rather than being—well, like, for example, when I was a freshman, we had to be in by ten o'clock at night, and we couldn't have men in our rooms, and there was a thing called “campusing,” where if you stayed out too late, you were campused for the next weekend, or something like that. Well, this is just such a nice situation. It's a real life-like situation. We have twenty-four-hour visitation, which is really interesting, too. Anyone can come on

the floor at any time, any male or female. It's a little bit more real.

This year, I headed a small committee in our dorm to try to get a coed floor in White Pine Hall. I know—it's "not accepted," and I don't think it's been approved, and I don't think it will be approved. But we did suggest it, and I think it's got some merit. What our plan was, was to convert one floor in the dorm so that there will be alternating suites, male and female. White Pine Hall is set up where there are six suites on each floor, except for the first. Within each suite there are four bedrooms, one living room, and two bathrooms. It's a self-contained unit. And there is an outside corridor so that you're not inside of the dorm—like Nye Hall or Juniper Hall or Manzanita Hall, where you have to walk down the hall inside, you know. You would take care of all your business, all of your studying, all of your living right within your room. You wouldn't have to walk down the hall to go to the bathroom, or down the hall to get a drink. You would be living right there, in one unit. So we felt that because of this ideal situation in White Pine Hall, we can have alternating suites of male and female, which would make it even more real, where you'd have an opportunity to meet people of the opposite sex, and [have] even a more brother-sister relationship— [or] more—well, closer relationships.

We didn't anticipate that people would have more intimate relationships, and I think that's a fear that administration have, which is not a real fear, because I don't think that's a problem facing dorm students. Kids are—by the time they get to college—old enough to take care of themselves, and I don't believe that just because you're living right next door to a person of the opposite sex that they're necessarily going to be less moral, or—you know, loose, or anything like that.

But anyway—what we proposed was the first suite'd be male, and the second suite'd be female, third suite'd be male, and so on, so that we'd have equal number of male and female on one floor. We submitted it to Jack Tyler, Dean of Housing, and he submitted it to Dean (Roberta] Barnes, and I think somewhere up on the line it got hung up—I think in a president's cabinet meeting, as I understand it. It's really too bad. I think they're afraid of the legislature, although I'm not sure how real a threat that is. I think if we conduct ourselves well, I hope that we can be more progressive.

I don't like always being fearful of doing anything, and this applies to dorm life, or student government, or just plain old activity on campus, for fear of negative repercussions. I don't like always saying, "Well, what's the legislature going to say?" Because we're real people. Now, we have real concerns, and we have things that we feel would benefit us, as well as other students. It's really a shame that everyone can say, "Yeah, it's a good idea, except we don't think the legislature's going to buy it." It seems to me there's often too much pressure from the community, and I think the press sometimes is at fault when they print stories that show negative, way blown-out [of proportion] pictures of students, or of the University, that aren't really true. I think that they create a fear in a number of people in the community, and in the legislature, and in the regents. And everyone says, "Wait a second. We can't do anything." You know, "What's going to happen with the legislature? We're going to get our budget cut." Everybody's really afraid, and then we don't do anything. We don't progress.

Ruth G. Hilts: If other dorms are coed, why did they disagree about White Pine Hall?

Well, other dorms are coed but not by floor. See, we have a coed dorm now, but we

were just trying to get a coed floor. A coed floor is a new thing on this campus.

Next year, for the dorms, there's another interesting development taking place. We're going to have two student resident directors. Kevin Anderson, who's a graduate student, will be the resident director of White Pine Hall. And Dale Pappas, an undergraduate student, will be the resident director of Lincoln Hall, which is really interesting, because no longer do you have the adult image. You have a student image, and it'll be a totally student-run dorm, and it's going to be different. We're going to have to take a lot more of the responsibility. We can't always turn to an adult and say, "What should I do? Give me some advice on this." Instead, we'll have to take full responsibility for what we do and what we decide. It'll be sort of an experiment, I think. I think they made wise choices, and I have a lot of respect for the people they hired. Both of 'em are outstanding people. But it's going to be interesting that it's completely student-run.

Regarding the interests that dorm students have, they have a different type of interest oftentimes than do students who live off campus, or students who live in a fraternity or a sorority [house]. Dorm kids on campus live right on campus. And it's not just that they live there, they spend all their time there. They're required to be there. They live in small, compact little rooms, and there's not often a lot for them to do. There aren't the activities that the Greeks have, and if you live off campus, you oftentimes live with friends in an apartment, and you have apartment activities, or you have family activities, and other off-campus activities, especially if you're from the Reno area, or Sparks area, and you know what's available, and you know what to do, and you've done it ever since you were a child. But dorm students usually come from out of town, a number of them from the

smaller towns out in Nevada or from out of state, and they don't know what to do. [They] sometimes just don't have many activities. Some of them seem to be more bored than they perhaps should be.

One thing I'd like to see is to have more activities, either from the ASUN government or from their own dorm governments. Dorms often don't have much money to spend. There's a ten-dollar fee every semester, a dorm fee for students who live there, but there are only a few movies, there aren't many extra activities, and you find students being with a bunch of other students, and not knowing exactly what there is to do and how to involve themselves in other types of activities.

Are they more likely, then, to take advantage of things on campus, such as the movies that are sponsored by the Student Union, and that sort of thing?

They do. I think some of them do become more involved in some activities, but on the other hand, I think they might slip into kind of a rut, where they say that there's nothing to do, and consequently, when there is something to do, they really don't want to do it because they're so bored, and they don't want to get out. I found that to be true in a few cases, but on the other hand, you know, you can't generalize about all the students, because there are a lot of students who take advantage of most things that come along. But I would like to see more things going, more outings.

The outing club this year had a few activities, where they went on picnics, or hiking, or toured something like the state capitol, or a museum in Virginia City, or something like that. That was good, because students had a chance to get out and see Nevada, you know, rather than just being locked up on campus so much.

I found this spring that a number of students who lived on my floor have been going home on weekends. The dorm gets really quiet. And I think that's because there isn't anything for 'em to do, and I think they get tired of being there. I think if there were more activities, there'd be more students who'd be more willing to live in the dorms.

Now, if you're a freshman or a sophomore under twenty-one, you have to live in the dorms. And that's unfortunate, you know, in many ways, because students feel that they are locked up there, and they don't like that. They would rather live someplace else, but they Can't. And consequently they feel that the dorms are not a good place to live. They complain about the food, they complain about the noise, they complain about the fact that there's nothing for them to do. It's a common belief that the dorms are often not a really ideal place to live.

There's a new idea I've heard mentioned, that the Universities in this country should get out of the dorm business, that it's not the business of a university to be running dorms. Do you think it's possible to run a university without housing facilities?

Well, it might be possible. The problem is, on this campus, that we have those dorms. We [already] have them now. And they're big things, and they cost a lot of money, and there's a lot of mortgage and loan money that has to be paid back. And secondly, there are a number of students—well, the housing situation's crowded off campus, too, and rent's really high. It's difficult to find housing, especially housing close to campus. And so, for those students, I think it's good to have dorms where they can live, and a dining commons for those who don't care to cook.

One idea that I heard talked about—and I don't even know where it is—but one of the deans was saying if they built any more dorms, they should be apartment-type dorms. And that would be a good idea, perhaps some like that at University village, where they have, you know, a lawn, maybe, and a kitchen, and a place where you can live, rather than just have one little corner, [a] little cubicle room where you stay. However, I think the University should provide some dorms, some living accommodations for students.

I also lived in the dorms this last summer in a little different capacity. I was a tutor-counselor for Project Upward Bound, which is a federal program for high school students. It's a precollege program where the students are encouraged to prepare for college, and where they have an opportunity to make up any deficiencies they may have. Some of the students have a potential to achieve, but haven't quite been able to because of all kinds of reasons— for financial reasons, for family hardship reasons. Many of the students are minority students and have a problem with discrimination in the schools and are not treated fairly by teachers. And a number of the students come from rural Nevada, where they're really not exposed to a lot of things that're going on in the world. I think sometimes they get a little limited, a little “shaded” type of picture of what's going on in the big city of Reno, and the big state of Nevada [laughing]. I think they don't always have an opportunity to know what's going on; they really are bright kids, but they just don't have a chance to succeed because they haven't been opened up.

The project runs for six weeks. Last year I was a tutor-counselor on the staff. There were about, oh, twenty of us who lived in the dorm and helped enforce rules, as well as help with things like making sure everyone got to where

they were supposed to. The kids are really bright kids, and they plan what they want to do, but we sort of try to organize it.

I should say a little bit about what the program is. It's an academic program. Two thirds of the students, the students who have not graduated from high school, are required to take what we call Upward Bound classes. Last summer these were reading, speech, and English. Students were required to take those, and then there were a list of electives, and I'm sure I can't remember them all, but there were at least a few of them—psychology, drama, philosophy, creative writing, art, social problems and modern issues. There were a number of classes where they could get into specific areas that they were interested in.

Are these campus classes, or did you conduct them in the dorm?

We held our classes over in Fleischmann Ag, in Mack Social Science, Church Fine Arts, and there were other buildings on campus, too, that we used. The students who had graduated from high school who were still in the program took University classes, Speech 113, and English 101.

Now, students in the program are in the program for three years. They usually are recruited when they are [high school] sophomores, and when they are accepted into the program, they elect to stay there for three years, so that there is a long follow-up [and] so that there's a chance to really get involved with the student, and to really try to help him, and watch him, and guide him as he grows. It's not a one-shot thing, where you either make it or you don't in one summer. You stay in the program, and you get involved in the program.

Then there's another program here on campus called Special Services, which is also

a federal program, which includes most of these students, if not all of them, and provides counselors for those students. The counselors in Special Services are the counselors for these students, and they help them with financial problems and with academic problems.

Once they've actually come to the University, Special Services takes over?

Right. So it's a long program. It's from the sophomore year in high school to the senior year in college. Many of these students who statistics say would not achieve, at our campus, at least, do achieve. A number of students who were once in Upward Bound have graduated from college, and are going out into the world, and, you know, [are or are becoming] wonderful people. They're achieving. They're graduating. They're getting into better jobs, and they're not being stuck in the poverty of either the Black community in Reno, the Black ghetto, the Indian community, or some of the small rural towns out in northern Nevada (which can be really depressing). A lot of people don't get out of there. They get stuck there for all their life. And this is an opportunity where, hopefully, they'll at least have a chance and some support.

I don't think I touched on all of what Upward Bound is.

I was curious about the proportion of rural whites to what they call minorities—Blacks, Indians, Asians, and so forth.

The statistics are approximately—and this isn't exact, by any stretch—there's about a third Caucasian students, a third Black students, and a third Indian students. There are also a few Asian and Chicano students. Oh, and one other statistic—it's about fifty-fifty male-female, so that it's a pretty well-rounded program. You get students from all

backgrounds. You get 'em from all different areas. You find students from rural Nevada who have never known a student from the city. And on the other hand, you find students from, say, Hug High School, who have never known anyone from, say, McDermit High School. It's quite a comparison. They learn a lot about people. It's a really growing program, a growing situation. I plan to work there this summer, also.

Having been involved with some minority students during Upward Bound, and been able to know them a little bit better, by being able to talk with them on a more personal basis about how they feel, what sort of discrimination they feel, and how they feel about being a minority person, I think I've been able to appreciate some of their feelings a little better, perhaps, than the average person would who has not been in such direct contact. I'd like to talk a little bit about the Ethnic Studies Program on this campus because I think a number of the students who were in Upward Bound last summer, especially minority students, have been involved in taking some of the Ethnic Studies Program's classes that were offered this year.

This year, this spring, the Ethnic Studies Program received \$1,750 dollars from the ASUN government. They also asked the Center for Religion and Life across the street for \$1,000 for the program. Now, with this money, the \$2,750, they offered students on this campus two classes, one, American History³ the Black Experience, which is a history class, History 453, taught by Dr. Joseph Metzgar, and they offered an Indian politics class, which was taught by Faun Mortara in the political science department.

I took the Black history class. It's been an excellent class. Dr. Metzgar has lectured a few times, but mostly, oftentimes, he has

brought in visiting lecturers, which is why they needed so much money, to pay for transportation and incidental fees for some of the traveling people. People who we've heard this year include Dr. Leonard Jeffries, who is, I believe, chairman of the Black Studies Program at San Jose State college. He lectured, oh, probably four or five times. And also, Dr. St. Clair Drake, who is chairman of the African and African-American Studies Program at Stanford University. He will have been here four times by the end of the year. One other lecturer we heard was Mr. Alex Haley, who wrote the Autobiography of Malcolm X.

The class has just been excellent. These men are all Black men, and they're very eloquent people, eloquent speakers, and they know their field. It's just extremely exciting to take a class from a person who is so totally involved in his work, especially something like the Black history, because so much of our history [that] we learn about has left out the Black experience. It's amazing to me, after having almost completed this class, how much I've learned about the Black experience. I had no idea it even existed. I had no idea about, for example, the rebellions, and the riots, and the attempts of change in the system back in the 1860's, nor did I know that there were a lot of Black congressmen who'd been elected to the U. S. Congress, or Blacks who'd held really high offices, and where discrimination was not so evident. Well, there was still discrimination and still slavery, but on the other hand, there was a short period where Blacks had more chance to achieve, and where they weren't so put down as they are now.

It's unfortunate that more students didn't take the class because it's been such an enlightening one. Probably there were—oh, I would say between fifty and seventy-five

[students], and probably, over half the class was Black. It's been the most exciting class I think I've had at this university in many ways. People talk about the "minority problem," as they call it, the "minority situation," or the "ethnic situation," but they don't really know what they're talking about, you know. And I think that the students who took this class have a good background in Black history and the Black experience in America. It's been an outstanding class. It was excellent, the way it was set up, with having those visiting professors here. St. Clair Drake is a noted social anthropologist from Stanford. He's interesting to listen to, he's witty, he's bright, he's articulate, and he knows what he's talking about, and it's just really exciting to be in his class. It's unfortunate that more people didn't take the class. It's also unfortunate that more didn't just come to listen, because these are excellent speakers and lecturers. I really enjoyed taking the class. I hope that next year that someone can offer more ethnic studies classes.

Is this an ongoing class? You kids financed it this time, but will it continue?

No, it won't. Now, as I understand the situation on this campus, a man named Michael Coray, who, I believe is receiving his Ph.D. this year from UC Santa Barbara, will be here next year, will be a history professor, and will probably at that time— and I'm not sure about this—but I think he'll probably take over the Ethnic Studies Program, and will teach some classes in Black history in America, and also, African history, which is something that we don't have. I understand that he's really qualified to talk about that.

I should say one other class that was offered (and I didn't take this class so I can't speak about it as much in depth) was also

an Indian politics class. I hope that they can be expanded next year. As I understand it, there has been approximately a thousand dollars allocated next year for an Ethnic Studies Program. Now, a thousand dollars does not go very far, and it indicates to me a lack of willingness on someone's part, perhaps the administration, maybe the Board of Regents—I'm not really sure who holds the final responsibility. But someone is not showing much concern at all for the minority situation on this campus if all they can allocate is one thousand dollars for a year's program, when this year the \$2,750 came from the Center and Associated Students. It really shows to me that there's not much concern—or there's perhaps some concern, but they aren't willing to do anything about it.

Well, now, I should clarify this. Michael Coray's salary is not included in this (one thousand dollars). So the total budget is whatever his salary is, plus a thousand dollars. I'm not so sure that it's such a good thing to bring a qualified person here to talk if all you have is a thousand dollars. You can't set up any kind of a program. You can't set up any involving type of program for the students. You can pay for one professor, but he's qualified in one area, or two areas, you know, the Black situation. He's not qualified in Indian problems, the problems faced by Asian students here today, or the Asian history, or the Puerto Rican history, or the Indian situation. The Indian situation at Nevada should certainly be covered; there're so many Indians that live here, and they need a chance to learn of their heritage.

So it will be interesting next year when Michael Coray's here, to see what kind of class he's going to teach. I'm really excited about it. I saw him one time. He's tall, and really distinguished-looking.

Have you heard him talk?

No—well, I sort of did. We were at a reception, and I just listened to him for a second.

Besides the program, besides the classes, which is an academic thing on this campus, I should just comment that as a student, and as a student involved in student government, that I've seen a lot of discrimination, and I've seen a lot of instances where minority students have not been treated equally. I can go into a lot of personal experience, where I've been with minority students where I have not been treated like I would have been treated had I been with a Caucasian person. I've found that to be true in a number of cases. And I think that there are a lot of very biased and very bigoted people on this campus.

One other thing with regard to the minority situation on this campus, in October, there was an incident with the BSU and the ASUN offices, where the BSU felt that they should have an office, and they came in and took over an ASUN office. I think that that sort of was an attempt to show people that there are minority students on campus, and they do have problems because of their color, and they were trying to make that known to people. The office was sort of symbolic.

However, I do feel that the BSU needs an office, and I feel that a lot of student groups on campus do, too. Last spring—or sometime this year, the ASUN Finance Control Board, of which I was a member, and of which this year I am chairman, voted to allocate 4,000 to renovate the space which is now a storage space, down in the basement of the Student Services building, in back of what is now the Sagebrush office. There's a large room down there, and President Miller has given us permission to use that space, so all we have to do is fix it up. It's now a B and G [Buildings

and Grounds] storage space, but we're going to fix it up.

Now, we had hoped to have it done this spring, but as things go on this campus, it moved really slowly. That's one thing I intend to get done this summer as a vice president. The office space will be ready to go in September. We have asked various organizations to please explain why they need an office, and can they justify their need, and then we'll allocate the office space. We probably will have seven or eight offices down there, and maybe a big "rap room," or a conference-type room, or something. They won't be really fancy offices, but at least students will be able to meet there, and carry on organization business. They'll probably have a desk and a phone and a file, a locked file, where they can keep their records. Some of the organizations now are a little haphazard because, you know, one student will be a president this year, and he'll graduate and take all the group's material with him, and then all the records are gone. So now, hopefully, they'll be kept, and there'll be some continuity. So that's one of the things that will be done for minority students' organizations, as well as for other groups. It came about as a result—this is occurring as a result of the BSU incident in October, and I'm certain the BSU will finally have an office.

Have you talked to any of the BSU kids? Will they accept an office there now?

Oh, yeah. At first, they had been invited to share offices with other organizations, and that's not a type of situation which is conducive to getting anything done. This'll be their own office, which they can run as they please. The ASUN will oversee it, and will be responsible for the space, but I don't anticipate any stringent controls where they can't operate as they please. So that's just one

other thing that the student body's done to try to help alleviate the minority problem.

With regard to student activities, I'd just like to comment that last Saturday night, I attended the ASUN and University Theater production of "Fiddler on the Roof." It was a play held in the Pioneer-Theater Auditorium. It was an excellent play, and it was really well done.

The interesting thing about this play was that there were a lot of community people involved. It wasn't just a University production. It wasn't just students doing it. The lead male [Jon Price] is a teacher at Manogue High School, and the lead female, Eve Loomis, is a drama teacher at Hug High School. They did a great job. I've heard so many good comments about this, and I think it's an excellent chance for students and the community to work together, and I think it's also good that Reno has a chance to see something a little bit more cultural, a little bit more creative, a little bit more fun. It's not always the gambling casino-type shows that you'd see at Harrah's, or in the showrooms, or something like that. Instead, it's something that the people here are working to produce. And it was really exciting to see the play.

It's excellent for public relations. There were a lot of community people in attendance. I think there were slightly over a thousand students who attended both nights, and that's quite a few students, when you consider that's a little over a fifth of the student body, and especially when you consider that UNR students seem to be a little slow about getting into some new things. The first time you try new things, you have to be really cautious. Pete Perriera, Assistant Dean of Students (Activities and Union), was talking this morning about putting on another production next year, like 'Man of La Mancha,' or "Carousel." Is that what it is, now?

Not "Carousel." No, I was thinkin' of the fancy one in England. You know, King—. "Camelot." I think he mentioned "Camelot," too. Anyway, in any event, I think the Activities Board is considering putting on something for the next year, and seeing how well it went off this year, they'd be wise to do another one next year.

Perhaps one of the most glaring problems on this campus, and one of the big issues that came out this year—and I think will continue to come out—is the women's situation. One of the indications of discrimination and unequal treatment is the division of the intercollegiate athletic fee, which the Board of Regents set last spring. Out of the seven dollars and fifty cents' fee for intercollegiate athletics, which every full-time fee-paying student must pay at registration, fifty cents of that goes to women students (to women's intercollegiate athletics). So you have a situation where men receive seven dollars, and women receive fifty cents. And it's quite an inequity. Women students don't have the same opportunity to get involved in athletics that men students do. With this situation in particular, I think it'd be easy to rectify this problem, where the fee would be more equally split. I'm not saying equal, fifty-fifty, but I'm saying that there should be a little more equality, perhaps two dollars of the fee, or two-fifty of the fee, should go to women's athletics. After all, women pay half of the fees, so they should receive a larger share of the advantages. Some people feel there's a little more involvement in men's intercollegiate athletics—but I think that women should at least have more of an opportunity to be involved in things that they want to be included in.

A class that some people are talking about is a political science class that might be offered next year, which will deal with women in politics. I'd just like to say that if there's a chance that this class'll be offered,

I think it would be a good opportunity for women to be able to learn about what other women have done in politics. I think if people will spend the time to look, I think that they will realize that women have been active in this country, and in its government and its politics and its policy making decisions. I think it's unfortunate that more women aren't involved, and I think a class like this would help more women to feel that they are capable and can achieve things, either in politics, or in school, or in any type of institution and not be delegated to the role of being only a mother or a wife or a secretary or teacher, or other traditional female roles.

As a vice president, some students have come to me and said, "Well, you're a woman student, and you should be more concerned about women's activities, and you should be trying to do things for women. You should look at the Commission on the Status of Women's report and find out how much discrimination there is, and then use your position as best you can to try to do something about this."

Now, that puts me in sort of a difficult situation sometimes. I find myself looking at them and saying, "If it's a valid point, if it's something that's really valid, then I'll agree to work on it." But sometimes I think that it's easy to get really carried away on the women's thing and say that all the time and all the energy must be spent on this type of thing, and that's not my feeling. I was elected at-large by the student body, and I was elected by both men and women. And I feel a responsibility to all students, not just to women students.

Perhaps one other thing I will comment on, and this isn't only for women; this is also for men, but perhaps may be a little more beneficial for women: Last year, the ASUN financed a child care center, which has been located this spring semester over in the home

ec department. Dean Patricia A. Tripple has been kind enough to allow us to use the child development lab in the mornings from eight to twelve, and we have hired a child development graduate from this school who's running the program. It's now operating at full capacity. Parents who wish to enroll their students—or, maybe I shouldn't say enroll—who wish to leave their students in this child care center pay a nominal fee, something like twenty-five cents an hour, and then they are free to take classes.

A number of women have come to me this year and said, "What can we do about establishing it for next fall, because this is the only way I can afford to go to school. We got married when I was twenty. I hadn't finished school, I didn't think that I wanted to finish school, but now my children are three and four, and my husband can't babysit, and now I want to go to school. And it's too expensive to hire a babysitter." Now we can help these students. You can just take your child to the child care center, leave him or her there, and then pick him or her up after class. It's something that we are going to continue next year. It will go full time, from eight a.m. until late in the afternoon. Hopefully, this service will be used to the maximum by the students. Jane Davidsaver was the director last year and did an excellent job. I hope that the director will be as good next year.

This year, one of the things that student government tried to do was to adopt a new constitution. There are a lot of things in that new constitution that I approved of. I like the idea of making the ASUN Senate smaller, cutting it down, making people more responsible to their constituency, and not getting too tied up with, as has been called before, "dead wood." But I think one of the things that was really wrong in that constitution, and the reason I was opposed

to it, was that they tried to cut down one of the main boards of ASUN government, the Activities Board. As it stands now, there are three main boards: Finance Control Board, Publications Board, and Activities Board. And the idea of this constitution was to make Activities Board an advisory board to Finance Control Board. As I understand it, the system was set up a few years ago. (And I talked with Jim Hardesty, who was student body president a few years ago, and Lance Van Lydegraf, who was also very active in student government a few years ago, about the intentions of a new constitution. I believe Lance graduated in '69.) The idea was to have two separate boards that were equal, that had equal power, that had two different aims, two different areas that they were concerned with. One would be activities, which the Activities Board would take care of, such as lectures, concerts, the student union, and student life; and Finance Control Board would take care of things like operating expenses, managing the office, taking care of the book store, the Sagebrush, the Artemisia, and funding the smaller organizations such as the Rodeo Club, Women's Recreation Association, the jazz band, debate team, and other types of clubs and organizations.

But the idea in this constitution was to eliminate the Activities Board, and—well, I don't say eliminate— [but] to reduce the power of Activities Board to make it an advisory board, such that all their budget money and all the money that they spent would have to be approved [by] the Finance Control Board. Now, in my opinion, Activities Board has operated very well in the past. We've had good activities, and a lot of students did participate in them. And I think that they've shown that they've handled their money okay. Besides, they've got a great advisor in Pete Perriera. He does an outstanding job with

Activities. And I thought that they should retain their autonomy and their power, and that's why I was opposed to the constitution. Well, that was one reason. The other was simply that when it was set up, there was the explicit stipulation that the Activities Board had its powers, and the Finance Control Board had its powers. I was opposed to the constitution because it eliminated this distinction and made the Finance Control Board all-powerful. I don't know if that's why it was defeated. It needed a couple hundred more votes to pass, but that's why I didn't support the proposed constitution.

Sometimes it's good for me to evaluate student government. I've been involved in it for four years. I've been in Senate for three years, on Finance Control Board for two, and now I'm chairman of Finance Control Board and Publications Board, and a member of the Executive Council. To me, student government has been a real involving thing. I've gotten a lot out of it. I've spent a lot of time in it, I've been to a lot of committee meetings, and I've participated in numerous discussions about current topics of interest.

There's a great potential with student government, although there are a few problems that student government faces. One is that it's not taken too seriously, sometimes, I think, by the legislature, perhaps; the regents, especially; and sometimes the administration. Sometimes they may think it's fun and games, and something that we're not really too involved or concerned with. But of most of the people I've known who've been in student government, who've been there for two years (some people who come for one year don't seem to be too dedicated), people who stick around for two years, are really concerned about it and really feel that there's a potential. That's why I've done it, because I think there are a lot of things that we've

done, that we've accomplished, and things that we have yet to work on that are relevant and that are important. And that's why we do it, not because it's fun and games, or because we don't have anything better to do. I'm sure the people who are in government are bright people, and in the past, I think we've seen that they've been articulate and intelligent, and they've been concerned about things, and that's why they're in government. It's not a lark. It's a real thing.

Another problem that we have is not being taken seriously by the community at large and other people outside the University. Sometimes we're not taken too seriously by students, either, and I think it's because sometimes we have limited activities, because we have limited services that we provide to the students, which is why I'm always on the lookout for new types of things that we can expand into. Students, if they would get involved and support their government, and would elect officers who they feel are competent and who express the opinion that they would like to see expressed to the administration or to the regents, could get a lot out of it. It's sort of the age-old question of getting people to vote, getting people out, trying to get people involved in what's really going on. I think that's where improvements come, when people say, "Okay, it's time for a change. We're going to do something about it," and they go out and they do it, one way or the other, whether it's a riot, whether it's voting, whether it's little grass roots things, like the McGovern campaign is now. Somehow or another, we've got to get going on it. I think if people would support student government, they would find many advantages, and our government would be able to be much more effective.

One important thing that we plan to do in student government this year is to try to

represent the University and the students as best we can to the legislature, and to try to get some of the money back that has not always been approved in our budgets. Rick Elmore and I both were interns last year in the legislature, and we both have an idea of how things go down there, how to get about getting things passed, where to lobby, where to try to get to people to make them understand what's going on.

There's always a lot of criticism down there about what students are doing. I remember the time one day, the legislature [had] a poem that had been written by Dave Phoenix in the English department, which they called a very obscene poem. [It] had been passed out on the desks of all the legislators, and they said, "My God, what are they reading up there? What are they teaching my children?" You know, it's that type of thing that student government should try to get around, you know, to try to say, "Hey, look it, maybe that wasn't right"—or, not even make a judgment on that, but just say, "If that occurs, there still are other people who express some of the views that you express, and who are good people, and who are mature people, and who are trying to accomplish something, and who are using the University as a means to a goal, for education."

So I think that we're going to try to present the University and young people as best we can to the legislature. And that means speaking in front of different committees on different topics; that means looking at the budget when it's coming out now and trying to get to the governor and say, "Hey, look. We need some money. You know, we need more money for ethnic studies. We need more money for the honors program. We need more money for faculty. We need more buildings," and try to explain to him and make him realize that it's not just, you know, "Well, we think we want it, so why don't you give it to us?" It's serious,

you know. A lot of peoples' lives are involved in it. You've got ten thousand people on this campus who come here every day, and it's their life. I would say probably ten thousand, if you consider students, and faculty, and personnel, and the administration. Maybe eight thousand. But there's a lot of people who are really affected by legislative action with regard to the University.

So that's one thing that we're trying to do, is to work with the legislature. In fact, Rick Elmore, who's the [new] student body president, was very careful when he chose his administrative assistant, Pat Murphy. Pat is chairman of the governor's Youth Advisory Council, and knows how Nevada state government functions, and will be very useful next year when it comes to putting together our program.

As far as student government goes now, there are some things that need to be done. There's a lot of issues that need to be looked into. Right now, one thing we're looking at right this very week is a new lake project. A proposal from the ASUN Senate last week, which was directed to me, says in effect that five hundred dollars will be set aside which will be spent at the end of next fall semester to be used to plant more fish and plants in Manzanita Lake. Dr. Mozingo of the biology department has agreed to teach a class (in the fall semester), and their focus will be on Manzanita Lake. They will look at the water, they will look at the fish, they will look at the plants, they will look at the silt level, at the oxidation level. They're looking at the ecology and the general makeup of the lake, and they're going to make some recommendations about what they feel would make the lake more ecologically sound and healthy. The only problem is that you have to have some money to finance this thing, so the ASUN government probably will get the

necessary money. There's a maximum limit of five hundred dollars on it now, but I think it will be less than that. I'm not sure. We'll have to wait until the end of next fall semester and find out what they [recommend].

One other topic that's been discussed this year has been the teacher-course evaluation. I think that's a really important vehicle for students to express their opinion about faculty and about courses. So many times you don't have an idea of what's being taught, how a teacher teaches, what sort of attitude he has toward students, what sort of method of teaching he has, whether it's a seminar class or a lecture class, whether he has lots of exams, or whether he requires lots of papers. This all makes a difference to many students, whether or not they take a class. I'm really in support of an evaluation such as we've had before. It needs to be refined a great deal.

Is it in progress?

Well, we had a teacher course evaluation for this spring that many professors gave to their classes. The results are being tabulated in the ASUN office right now, and will be printed, and will be Out before registration next year.

But there are a lot of complaints about the questionnaire, we made some mistakes this year which we can learn from. Hopefully, we can clean it up a little bit this next year, and make it a document where the students can really express their feelings about different courses and faculty.

Is this an ongoing project, then? I mean, will it be done every couple of years or so?

Yes. We'd like to have it—I'd like to see it done every semester. If we can iron out the problems, I think it can be very useful. It's

been done a couple times. It started back in '69— '69 or '70, when Jim Hardesty, I believe, had the first one that I can remember. And there were some problems in getting it out, getting it tabulated. I never really quite got it out to the students, and it's never quite been done well enough. But I hope that we can learn from this and get a little bit better hold of it for next year.

The student government operates on a budget of approximately \$200,000. At the beginning of each semester, we collect twenty dollars from every student, and there's approximately ten thousand students per year, which comes to a total of \$200,000. Now, a lot of that money is allocated to different areas, such as the Sagebrush, the Artemisia, and student union rent. We funded this year, for example, the Rodeo Club, the jazz band, WRA (Women's Recreation Association), the child care center, Experimental College and their athletic center and their reading library, AWS (Associated Women Students), and we funded numerous other organizations—a couple engineering societies, mechanical and civil engineering. And there's others that escape me at the moment. Oh, yes, most of the Ethnic Studies Program, also.

Well, then, student government really is big business, when you come right down to it?

Yeah, it sure is. When you're talking about \$200,000, you're talkin' about quite a bit of power. You're talking about a lot of responsibility. And maybe that's one of the reasons why students—

—*The ones who are in it.*

—take it so seriously. So there's a lot of money involved, and it's a big operation. We own and run the ASUN book store. We have

a full-time business manager, Mac Potter, who we just hired last year, last spring in April, who handles our financial and legal affairs., and we have our own office help. It's a big business. It's a real institution.

As far as my feelings about the University, and about school, and about what I'm gaining academically, as well as socially, this university perhaps isn't the best in academic standards, but on the other hand, there're so many things that I've gotten out of this university that I know I couldn't've received from other places. (I'm an out-of-state student from Bishop, California.) Because the University is so small, with [approximately 10,000 students, staff, and faculty, and with] only five thousand undergraduate students, there's an opportunity to get involved in things, and to be able to express yourself more openly. It's much easier to be heard in a crowd of five thousand than it is to be heard in a crowd of 30,000. (As you know, some student bodies are that large.) I just think that by the simple fact that I've been able to be in student government, that I've been able to be an intern in Carson City, the fact that I've been able to be a staff member, an RA, in the dorms, and been able to be involved in lots of different activities is an indication that, you know, the opportunities are open to students if they will just take them.

Academically, perhaps it may not be the very best, but on the other hand, you might have a very outstanding teacher and his class load might be a thousand students per class, say, [at the] University of California at any one of their campuses, or some of the larger schools. Or, you can be at the University of Nevada, and some of my classes—I've had five in some of my classes—and you can have seminars with twenty students in a class. Or you can have a really large class and have fifty or seventy-five students in a class. And

in that situation, you have an opportunity to meet with the teaching assistant, you have an opportunity to meet with the professor. I know some of my professors on a first-name basis, and I know that I'm not alone. There are some people who are concerned about education at the University of Nevada, and who are trying to do the best they can. I think that in numerous cases, they succeed. I have not really regretted coming here. A few times, I should say I've regretted coming to school here. You always wonder what's better in other places, but when I sit down and really look at it, I haven't regretted my decision. I think it's served my ends, and I think it's been a great experience, school.

BLACK STUDENT UNION

EMERSON S. DAVIS, PAST PRESIDENT

Emerson S. “Stan” Davis: My name is Stan Davis, and I was president of the Black Student Union of the University of Nevada from April of ’71 until January of ’72. The reasons why I wanted this position was because of the apathy and inadequacies that I saw that the previous BSU had [experienced]. Being only a sophomore and an out-of-state student were two of the disadvantages which I knew I would have initially. But still, I talked it over with a lot of people in my class, and we decided that we wanted to have somewhat of a change in ’71. So I won the election, a very close election, which created somewhat of a strife, but was remedied later on. Everyone had high hopes and high expectations in that spring, and I thought I could do a good job.

One of the first proposals that the BSU wanted was an office, or somewhere where we could call our own, realizing that we were—that is the BSU or Black people on this campus did not have very much. We [were] more or less aiming towards that as symbolism.

Ruth G. Hilts: Your office was a symbol?

More or less—until it was taken out of context when the crisis came.

In that spring, I tried many things. I talked to Dean [Robert G.] Kinney, and we decided to send out little [memorandums] to all incoming freshmen, to sorta keep in touch with the Black students that were coming in the fall. Everything I could think of, I attempted, at least. And so that’s the way it went.

I went home for the summer and just relaxed, and really contemplated [where] the BSU was going, what direction would it need, and what were some of the objectives that the Black students wanted. I came back in the fall with high expectations of getting an office. But I must be realistic and say that at that time, I wasn’t that much keen on getting one. It was—it really came by accident, which I will tell later. But the BSU really progressed well those first few months in the fall. We gave two or three dances, we gave a soul dinner, Helen White was nominated for Homecoming Queen, which she won, and which gave all the Blacks on campus pride, and what not. And

we really felt like we were heading somewhere. And so things really were progressing well.

The Blacks have somewhat of an organization, even though it could've been stronger. We had good rapport from the community. We tried to have relationships with the community. We tried to contact other organizations. I went to a meeting in Salt Lake City, at which all the BSU's on the West Coast met, and we attempted to call ourselves an organization.

I'd like to interject right now that the reason why there is a BSU on any campus in the United States is because the Blacks feel that the student government in office does not fulfill their expectations. Therefore, they see a necessity of having their own student government, so to speak of. And that's what the BSU is all about. Any school that has somewhat of a harmonious grouping usually do not have a BSU, or a strong BSU.

Okay. So the BSU decided to seek an office seriously around about October. What presented this was that one day I came to a meeting with whole gobs and gobs of paperwork. I came to the BSU meeting with an overabundance of papers that I shouldn't have been carrying around if I had an office. And this fact was pointed out to me by several members at the meeting that night. And all of a sudden, we got on the subject of getting an office. They stressed the fact that it made them look bad, made me look bad, and them, too, in that, here, their president's walkin' around with papers and papers' and papers, and nowhere to put 'em. And it's more or less like a shaft, you know. And that really was the catalyst to start the whole thing, believe it or not. It was really by accident, because Danny Klaich did tell me he was trying to get an office, even though I thought he was really just saying that, you know, [and] wasn't making any genuine effort. Like I said, I had talked

to Mr. Klaich in the spring about getting an office, and he attempted then, so he told me. I even wrote him during the summer about the possibility of—you know, availability of an office, at which time he said he was looking, and what not. So it wasn't somethin' like spontaneous, as [Dan Klaich] said.

We decided the next day to go see President Miller, at which time he recommended that we go and see Danny Klaich, which we did. And Mr. Klaich gave us more or less lip service, so we comprehended it. And so we came back later on that day to see Mr. Klaich again, at which time Mr. Klaich continued to give us lip service, and we decided to occupy an office.

We had thought about occupying an office, or talked about it, but, more or less, events just fell in order. We occupied the Vice President of Activities office, and we decided that we would stay there until the ASUN or the University came up with a comparable one to that. So that was our stand on that day, and we were prepared for a sit-in and for a long stay. We were determined because we felt we were right. BSU's in the past had requested an office and got nothing. BSU's in the past had requested other objectives, and had gotten lip service from the University. So just everything fell in place. Everything came down to one point.

I talked to other presidents, previous presidents of the BSU, and they reiterated what I had been told about their attempts to get some semblance of being part of the University. Blacks were not in any legislation bodies, they were not in any judicial councils, they were not in any policy-making committees at all. Blacks are in no fraternities, there are no Black faculty members to speak of on this campus, there is no place where Blacks or ethnic people can go and call their own, is the way I put it.

So it all boiled down to—really—the social, economical, and political conditions of the campus that decided to make us be so stubborn in keeping the office, because the office was really irrelevant. We can always get an office somewhere. But the mere fact of having an office in the ASUN and on this University symbolized to many Blacks that they are part of the University, whether they (the University) liked it or not. So that was more or less our policy. And that is what we talked about and what we decided on.

We stayed in the office for one week. At that time, Danny Klaich was supposedly looking for a comparable office for us. He came up with two alternatives. One was over at the Center of Religion [and Life], across the street from the University, and the other one was in the basement of the Student Services building. We rejected both of these on the grounds that the office at the Center is not part of the University, and we felt that we were just like being put in a corner to keep us quiet. And it should be apparent why we wouldn't want an office in the basement, knowing the tensions that were apparent in the air. And plus, the office in the basement had not been built yet. It was only speculative, in the future. And the place that they recommended in the basement was a place that had been closed down because of fire hazards. I may say, right now, that they are in the process of refurbishing this place, and they have offered this to the BSU now, [if] they want a place in it.

At any rate, we stayed in the office. We asked President Miller to intervene, and at that time he said that he had no jurisdiction over a matter that concerned the ASUN and a recognized organization of it. That's the stand he took. The BSU felt that President Miller could've remedied the problem immediately. The Blacks on campus have had great regard for President Miller, and great respect, and

we knew he was a man of his word, and we asked him to help us. We did not want to stay in the office, necessarily, but we more or less had taken a stand, and burned the bridges behind us.

So the week went by, and tension was in the air as we occupied the office. Two things happened in that week which made the Blacks more determined than ever to stay in office. One was a program that came on TV at which a Sundowner, or, I think, a member of some fraternity, said that if the Blacks were not removed from the office, that their organization would remove us, more or less, and that we had no business in the office, which only antagonized the situation. The other incident that happened in that week was a student senate meeting that went on, at which time there was, shall I say, a lot of vocal utterings from the Black Student Union and other factions of the campus that felt that we should not be in office. It really was almost—came down to, really—a race fight. Well, it was vocal to an extent, but it could very easily have turned into physical violence. And to be honest with you, I was prepared for the worst. So were the other Blacks.

The principal organization there that was vocalizing against us was the Sundowners. And later on, we found out that the Sundowners were not a recognized organization of the campus, and we didn't see any reason why they should be in the ASUN Senate, shouting their disapproval of our actions. Therefore, that made us even more determined to stay in the office.

So the final day came down, and the Black Student Union voted on a "no compromise" position. Therefore, my hands were tied. So we decided to stay in the office, no matter what, even if we didn't get a comparable office.

Five o'clock came, and President Miller did his sacred duty and told us what we were

doin' wrong, and the consequences that would be given to us if we stayed in the office. We decided to stay!

There were twenty-eight Blacks in the office, and sixteen were arrested [laughing]. We were removed from the office, to say the least [laughing].

Tell me about it. You say arrested, and you laugh. I'm not quite sure what you mean.

Well, there were certain internal actions that took place within the office that I don't think would be very [appropriate] to tell the public—

—*It's your option.*

—But maybe it should be said, since it's over with now. That is that the BSU had decided to evacuate the office in the event of, say, tear gas, or what not. I'd like to say that we did not seek—at least the majority of the BSU— did not seek to destroy the office, or anything. I just want to emphasize that it was only symbolism. We agreed on a policy that all we wanted the policemen to do was come in and knock down the door and take us to jail, which would serve our purpose—serve the symbolism purpose. We did not want any confrontation with policemen, and we didn't have any weapons. So it could've been worse. And all we were there [for] was to show to the campus, to Reno, and to the state how racist Nevada is. (And I think we did a marvelous job.)

So sixteen persons got arrested, and that created more problems—bail money, and lawyer monies, and what not, and that's how it went. After the sixteen were in jail, we got 'em out that night, and we came back on the campus to face what I call the white backlash of the campus.

At that time, that's when all the newspapermen, you know, [and] the interested liberals came around, and what not, and wanted to know what was going on, what they could do.

To fight back, we decided on several tactics. We decided to picket President Miller's office on the week following the day we were evacuated from the office. We decided to get the community involved, and to help them to apply pressure for us in getting an office. We decided to send to other BSU's across the country for help and monies, which we did get some support from other campuses, mainly the Las Vegas campus, and a couple of California schools. We decided to send one to California to acquire a Black lawyer to represent us. And we decided to ask the help of other Black organizations in Reno, such as the NAACP, and Race Relations Council, and, I think it's Project Outreach, out in northeast Reno. We asked all these organizations for help and guidance, at which time they did give us some help.

The community was very upset over what went on up on the campus, and they gave us their wholehearted support. They gave us money—especially the Second Baptist Church, which gave us a considerable sum.

When you say community, now, you mean the Black community?

Yes, they were members of the Black community. We couldn't say the whole community. But we did get somewhat of help from the community.

Looking back, I can only say that our greatest difficulty in those hours were organization. Like, it was a novelty to me and to many members of the BSU, and I feel kinda bad now because a lot of things didn't fall through— or, maybe they could have, if

there were organizations behind us, and what not, you know. We hadn't had experience. Because I think we could've—the community was ready, but we missed a chance of really mobilizing them because of inexperience. And that only goes back [to] no Black faculty direction on this campus for us. If we would've had a Black faculty, more or less, we probably wouldn't've been in this situation.

Are there no Black faculty members at all?

Well, they consider Otis Burrell and Alex Boyd as faculty members, and they also consider the other Blacks who work in capacities such as secretaries, administrative aides, and what not. There is some guy who's in the Medical School. I forget his name. I never met him. But that's only on paper. And I think they have one Black professor out at Stead somewhere, or something. But there was really no Black person, to speak of, where we could go and say, "Hey, man, we need some help. Could you talk to this guy for us?"

So, I guess it comes down to what was gained by the BSU thing. What did the Blacks think was gained? What did I think was gained from the whole thing? I really can't say that I see anything concretely gained directly from it, even though, now, in 1972, the University's in the process of obtaining a Black person to head an Ethnic Studies Program—which I found out the guy has accepted, which is good. The University is in the process of incorporating more Black subjects or ethnic-oriented subjects, which is—I guess you could say—is a plus. I think: more whites are more tolerant, or I should say, acknowledge the difference of Blacks and their problems. There are slightly more Blacks in the ASUN government now, but still not enough. The games—I really can't say.

One of the problems that was brought to me when I was president of the BSU was the problems that the Black athletes had on this campus towards the athletic department. I had heard from many members of previous Black athletes who had gotten, like we put it, the "sham" from the University. Even goin' back to Marion Motley, when he had to live in one room with his wife and baby, and no one cared to take an interest in him except for football. I heard from Alex Boyd and Otis Burrell. These guys've told me the problems that Blacks went through when they were comm' along. And the Blacks that are here tell me of the problems that they have had, especially in contact with the football program—of how they're gettin' the sham. I've heard many gripes about the athletic coaches who're just your friend dunn' the season; and dunn' the off-season, well, you make it the best way you can. The Blacks feel that—and when I say the Blacks feel that, (I don't mean] the coach is not givin' them a break into gettin' into the games, and what not—what we're talkin' about is this extra help, after the practice is over with, someone you can turn to, you know, and help you out. These are things we're talking about. We wanted a Black coach. They did have one in—what's his name?—[Rich] Patterson was in the capacity of assistant coach for one year, or two, I think, but this was not a lasting thing. And so the gripes kept coming in of how they felt the coaches were giving them the sham, simply because they were Black. I don't know how true it was, or what not, but there's an investigating committee on that now, so there might be some truth in it.

Previously restricted material appears in brackets. This material was restricted from publication of this volume until June 1974.—Ed.

[President Miller's resignation let the BSU in a very ambiguous position because this followed soon after the BSU office takeover, and seemingly, the BSU were directly opposed to President Miller and his principles of laissez-faire, as we put it, and was a committee man. We really took the position against President Miller. We really wanted his removal. But after the Blacks has contemplated it, and what not, we felt that perhaps it would be better to have president Miller here than probably have someone else who may be even more harshly against progressive ideas, as we put it.]

[This wasn't just a spontaneous thing on your part then? You figured it was the lesser of two evils, to support the President?]

[Yes.]

So Danny Klaich asked me would I like to go down and talk to the Board of Regents in support of President Miller, and which I agreed upon. [Restricted sentence] That was the direction. I had, that President Miller had a lot of things that we weren't particularly in favor of, but, to me and to the Blacks, he was basically a good man. So we decided to support him. And I did go down with Danny Klaich and talked to the Board of Regents in support of President Miller. I don't know if that had any effect or not, but I'm pretty sure it didn't detriment his case.

So I wouldn't say, rather, that we were really *happy* to have President Miller back. Personally, I did. But on a political spectrum, not really. We found that the biggest gripe with President Miller is that he always seems to put problems into committees, instead of committing himself—which is the general feeling of all, or most, of the students on this campus. President Miller's a great guy,

you know. If he makes a promise, he keeps it. But we felt that we need more dynamic leadership from President Miller, especially at that time. So that's President Miller.

As far as the hopes for the ASUN constitution, I did not get any feedback from the BSU, but I personally felt that it was more or less a token effort, to incorporate a Black person in the ASUN. We didn't want to come in like that because it was—it was more or less like comm' in the back door. We felt that if we got elected to the ASUN in any office, it had to be on our own merits, and not because we were a Black, which really was what it would be. For instance, if I was elected, then I would be limited in my influence because everyone would know I would be only representing the ethnic people here. We didn't want to come in that way.

So they asked me how did I feel about it. I told 'em that I personally was against it, and that I would not support it, and that I would stress to the BSU that I don't think they should support it.

As far as the new proposal to do away with out-of-state tuition, I don't see any great problem with that because most of the Blacks who do come from out of state are given tuition on athletic scholarships, so they really don't have this problem that maybe the average out-of-state student would have.

I could say that from some feedback from the members of the BSU, we felt that this out-of-state issue was more or less like tryin' to exclude certain people, or certain types of people from the University of Nevada. It would definitely exclude some Blacks because they cannot afford to pay \$1,200-plus to come to this University if they were not on athletic scholarships. Lookin' at it in an ethnic centered point of view, that's

the approach I took, even though I didn't have much information on the why's and where's of the issue.

One thing the University needs is diversity, even though it may polarize segments.

Comments on progress of the legal cases of Paul Adamian and James Richardson? Again, I did not get much information from many other slacks. But if I had to make a comment on it, I would say that they generally were behind Paul Adamian's stand, you know, and of James Richardson getting his promotion. James Richardson is a good friend of many of the Black students here, and I really think he richly deserves whatever he gets. And Paul Adamian—he was before my time, so to speak. But from what I've heard of him, simply because he was a rather progressive-looking young man who would not like to structure his classroom, that facilitated his downfall. And there are several other teachers who probably, eventually, will be systematically eliminated, as we put it.

As far as status of teacher-course evaluation—Blacks, the BSU, like any fraternity or sorority, has their informal evaluation of teachers. This presents no great problem, except when a Black student does get a teacher who cannot seem to understand his particular problem.

Many Blacks came to me when I was president in regards to how they thought the teacher was unfair to them or did not see their point of view. For instance, one young lady came to me. She was taking this English course, and she was having a little difficulty. And the reason why she was having difficulty was because she could not speak or write white middle-class English well. I should think that a teacher would take in consideration of the background of the person, and their speech habits, and speech patterns. And evaluating them in an English course, you just can't

preconceive that everyone in your class has taken middleclass white English and excelled in it. And, you know, little things like that, that perhaps a white person would never encounter, Black people encounter daily.

And for instance, when I took 101 English from this teacher, I got an Incomplete simply because I did not organize my thoughts the way he thought they should be organized on a paper. I couldn't just change my patterns of thought and writing from twelve years of education into one year of the way he wanted it. And he more or less made me feel like perhaps I wouldn't be able to get through school.

He gave you an Incomplete? SD: He gave me an Incomplete. RH: Did you know that he was trying to do something for you? He could have given you an F.

Well, sure, he could've given me an F—very, very true, except that I probably had done enough work to not merit that. But I felt that if this man really took an interest in me, he would've gave me a little extra help instead of giving me an Incomplete, which can be a great psychological blow for a Black person in a white school, whether they know it or not, especially in English.

Well, to make a long story short, I got my grade from him and went on to higher levels. The next semester, I got a 3.8 average, which told me that I could do the work, and I think maybe the English teacher was wrong.

But this is only an incident. I'm sure other Blacks have been through similar incidents to that, and it's really rough.

From the BSU thing, the office takeover, many Blacks left school, and many just completely gave up because they saw no hope here. Many Blacks simply became apathetic and failed their courses. I would say at least a

third of the Blacks that took part in the BSU office takeover are not here this semester, a third or more, for one reason or another.

As far as mandatory ROTC, that should be self-explanatory. I don't think any Black—at least, the Blacks that I have come in contact with, generally speaking, do not look in favor of the United States Government and [laughing] its exponents, such as the armed forces. We don't see any reason why Blacks should be indoctrinated into an ROTC program to fight for a country that cannot permit them to have an office [laughing]. So I'm pretty sure most of the Blacks have gone through the ROTC bag, and taken the course, but if it could be done away with, they would be that much happier.

As [past] president of the BSU, and looking, sort of, into the problems of the Blacks, I can say that it's really rather frustrating to go to the University of Nevada. The Blacks here have no social life. We do not have any political consciousness, simply because we feel that we cannot be incorporated into the political structure here. As far as economics, we are dependent more or less on either the Financial Aid office, or athletic coaches, which is a bother and a worrisome price to pay. But I imagine it's worth it.

Fraternities and sororities may have their parties on the weekend, but Blacks have nothin' to do. This is a problem of the University and the city. Lookin' at it from an ethnic-centered point of view, I'm pretty sure that the Indians and the Asians have similar problems.

You really can't tell a person how does it feel to be Black. And from my travels, I would say, indeed, Nevada is a very racist state, and people just feel that they can maintain it. They consider Nevada a "conservative" state, which it is, but as far as I'm concerned, there's a thin line between conservatism and racism,

because conservatism, see, tends to uphold the status quo. And if the status quo is racism, then they're upholding racism.

So, I mean—I don't think there are many Blacks here who are really happy, to put it bluntly, at the University of Nevada. Therefore, their—our whole education and grading, and what not, is going to be impaired, to some extent.

Do they get the kind of education they want?

We'll say no. I—personally, I'm not getting the kind of education I want. For instance, I came from an all-Black high school from an all-Black community, Washington, D. C. And the first contact I had with white people was when I came here. In Washington, where the subjects are geared toward a Black person, a Black person's way of thinking, the way he looks at society, you can learn a lot. You'd be surprised, to take a class such as a sociology class from a Black point of view, and such as the Black family structure, and things like that. You'd be surprised how much you could learn.

So, I really can't say that the Blacks are getting the education they want. Maybe they're not realizin' they're not getting the education they want. I don't think there's anything wrong with any teacher here teaching from a white point of view, because he is white, and that's the only way he can teach. Going into a history class, you expect a white man to teach from a white Anglo-Saxon point of view, because that's the way he's been told the country has derived the majority of his heritage from. I don't see anything wrong with that. But I think it wouldn't do no harm to have a Black history teacher here, or a Black sociology teacher. It wouldn't do no harm if Indian teachers [could] be Indian instructors here.

See, this is a pluralistic democracy that we have been indoctrinated to have had, and we don't have it, but there is tension in the classrooms. And that's the general feeling I think Blacks have. It's not the quality of education here improving or decreasing, you know. In my personal experience, I don't consider Reno—University of Nevada—as a Harvard [laughing], to say the least. It does give you an education, or indoctrination, depending on your point of view. All I can say is that the University of Nevada has potential. But for a Black person, I can't help but think that it is only indoctrinating him to go out into the system. That's the attitude any Black who has read a lot would take.

You may ask yourself why do Blacks come here to go to school when they could go to other schools, other white schools. I've asked many Blacks in the BSU during this year why did they come here? And many of them give an economic reason, because they are "getting money to come here," more or less, or that they "haven't been out West," or something like that.

The reason why I came here was because they're no white people in Washington, D. C., to speak of, that any average Black comes in contact with. I'd never been out West. I got a scholarship to come here. You know—just everything fell in place, you know—and bein' away from home.

A lot of disturbing statistics were brought to me when I was president of the BSG. For instance, how many Blacks have graduated from here from 1916 would shock you. I don't know how many Blacks have been here; I don't know the correct numbers, but I think over thirty Blacks have graduated from here since 1917 or '16. There's a great turnover of Blacks, in failing, or on disciplinary probation, and what not. That's a really pathetic fact, when you look back.

Our population, of course, until the last few years, had very, very few Black people.

Yes. The Reno community has only five thousand, four thousand Blacks.

There used to be just a few families.

Yeah, that's what I was told, and discrimination down at the clubs, and what not. Many Blacks remember this, you know.

I'd like to interject this—I went out into the community [on] numerous occasions when I was [BSU] president, and I always seemed to get an antagonistic feeling from Blacks toward the University. They more or less feel like the University is not a part of them. I mean, it's not like, "I want to send my son to this University," sort of attitude. They'd rather their kids go elsewhere. And there's just really—. There's no feeling for our own University. And, I mean, that's really a shame. But I could gather that maybe that's the predominant—.

Because they didn't grow up here? That's possible.

That's true. A lot of Blacks have migrated from California or from the Southern states to Reno. If you check your statistics, you'll find that almost half of the Blacks that go here are from out of state. And yet, you check with the Blacks who live here, what do they do? Where do they go? What're they doing, you know? This is their state. This is their university.

These were problems that bothered me when I was president of the BSU. I found that not many people would really back Blacks when it comes down to a showdown. I guess [laughing] that would be the most natural thing to do, if you've got a wife and five kids. There's no sense of, "I can lean on somebody." There's no sense of, "I can go to somebody to

help me out.” If they do go to somebody, it’s not with high expectations. I imagine things are changing. But—.

That’s rather typical of all people in the West, I think. We’re not used to looking to someone else.

Perhaps that’s true. Could be.

Okay. Coming from Washington, D. C. was more or less like a traumatic experience for me. I guess it would be for any Black kid comm’ from a metropolitan city in the United States that have a sizable minority of Blacks. That is, to put it simple, Blacks don’t take a lot of care for whites. I won’t use the word “hate,” maybe that’s a little too strong—I can’t verify that. But there’s a great distrust and animosity against white people in Washington. And I was incorporated into this way of thinking, and I grew up this way. And the way I think about it, many people could justify why they had this animosity against whites. D. C. has very, very poor schools, especially public schools. And this has only come in the ’60’s, when the schools became predominantly white. Well, at any rate, D. C. doesn’t have any home rule to organize it, and it is—generally, there is no interaction between the Blacks and whites, so Blacks fantasize or prophesize how white people think about them, and the white people’s way of living.

Like, for [laughing] instance, in Washington, I couldn’t conceive of any white person being poor. I had never seen a poor white person. I never even seen a white kid my own age, except maybe when I went out in Maryland or Virginia. It was just a whole Black community. I can’t say that it wasn’t a pleasant place to grow up, because bein’ there, I did not have the psychological strains of day-to-day contact with white people, which does—it strains me now, because you

never—you never know if this white person’s prejudiced against you or not. You just can’t assume that this person is all right. And it wears you down after a while.

D. C. is just a whole different world. Like that [Kerner] commission report said, we’re livin’ in two different societies. I’ve been in both of ’em [laughing]. I personally think the country is bein’ polarized. There is progress being made, but—the way I put it, it’s only bein’ made at the top. I mean, any Black, now, with a Ph.D. can go anywhere in the country. But still, that poor Black guy who makes \$4,-\$3,000 a year is in the same boat he was in a hundred years ago, the same as white people. And he doesn’t feel any change.

He doesn’t feel akin to the white man who’s just as poor as he is, then?

Exactly. He doesn’t. He’s just alienated. He doesn’t feel any kin to the Blacks who are higher than he is, or he doesn’t feel any kin to the whites who are poor, who are on the same level he is. So he’s in a rut, you know. That is where the catalyst of any violence will be started, I think, in the future. [This is how I] understand, how I am perceiving this. Maybe some other person of the BSU would perceive events differently. But see, I’m only, you know, the stun of my total experiences. And I would consider myself, in the BSU, as a moderate. But talking to a white person, they would probably consider me a little leftist or radical in thinking—you know, a pessimistic point of view.

So I went home that Christmas [1971] and I talked it over with my family, and did a lot of soul searching. And I felt that maybe the best thing for me and the BSU was for me to resign, which I did, the third week of January. The reasons why I resigned were numerous and really complex, [and] in no particular order.

I felt that, .for one, the BSU did not give me enough support in the crisis months. I felt that they could do a lot on their own, which they didn't, and that they left a lot of the work up to me, which I did not think was right. I felt that I had served my purpose, so to speak., in exploiting the BSU's position so that whites can see their point of view. I felt that it was too much of a strain for one person to try to fight a whole city and a whole [student] body. (Don't get me wrong—there were people who were behind me, who were doing things, but I'm speakin' of the rank and file.) I was goin' through too many committees, and I was getting behind in my studies. Of course, you could say, "Well, which is more important?" [laughing] Right now, I don't think it's important for me to drop out of school, or fail out of school, and become nothing [just] to combat racism. When maybe I can get at a higher level, I can try to get more done. I felt that the BSU needs a fresh approach, a fresh face, because now is a time where, if anything was going to be changed, it was going to happen. I felt that Sporty Willis, who is president now, could do a pretty good job in representing the Black students. And I thought the Black students more or less were a little tired of the whole thing. I thought a couple of months away from the issues would help the general atmosphere of the campus, instead of me stayin' there and keep exploiting the [laughing] Black positions.

So I was really tired around January, and I was disappointed and frustrated to the extent that I was impairing my effectiveness. So I just resigned. I resigned, and Quentin Cary, treasurer of the BSU, resigned, but for different reasons. So Sporty Willis is president now. I haven't been to too many BSU meetings, so I couldn't tell you what they are doing now.

You don't feel a part of it any more?

Well, I wouldn't say I don't feel a part of it. I feel that with Stan Davis around, now, it more or less, like, brings back memories of things that maybe shouldn't be refreshed right now. Not that I don't see 'em, or anything, but I think the organization can do without me, at least until the next elections, when I probably will get back, actively involved. I decided that, personally, the best thing I could do to fight racism here, and to help Blacks, to help bring about change, is for me to take a solo venture—that is, try to get things done from an individual point of view. I met a lot of people when I was president, and I thought I could get things done goin' in and bein' Stan Davis (instead of] Stan Davis, president of the BSU, see. So this is what I did.

I went around and talked to Dean Kinney; we got a pretty good rapport. I was elected on the Judicial Council. I was contemplating running for the [ASUN] senate, but I decided in favor of the Judicial Council because I felt I could have, more influence on there, and implement more changes. I got involved in the dorms. I'm seekin' to become an RA [resident assistant]. I was elected vice president of Lincoln Hall just this week. I'm tryin' to work out some kind of relationship with Dean Kinney in which I can maybe work in his office to learn what goes on in a dean's office, you know, because Blacks don't know. And there are a lot of times they just come to me askin', and maybe I could just send them to someone else, who can maybe give them advice.

So I'm on a solo trip, or bag, right now. It's workin' out pretty much. But the BSU days are gone [laughing].

BOARD OF REGENTS

HAROLD JACOBSEN, CHAIRMAN

Harold Jacobsen: This is Harold Jacobsen, the chairman of the Board of Regents. I have been chairman for about sixteen months at this writing. It's been an exciting sixteen months.

The first thing that I had to do as chairman was to recognize that my role was much different than it had been as just a regular member of the board. On the board, as a regular member, I probably was the most outspoken member of the board, and I was the one that did much of the interrogating when we had people before the board to testify. This has since been taken over by some of the other members of the board—no one in particular. Then, one day, I recognized that any statements that I made carried a lot more weight, because I was a spokesman for the board. And I also recognized that the chairman of the board has to know pretty much what's going on before the meetings. He has to really sit down and take a good look at the agenda and the problems, and guess at what might happen, and who would make comments, and what the reaction would be

by the public, or the faculty, or whoever was concerned.

The chancellor and I have a meeting, a breakfast, about ten days before the meeting—or, probably about twelve days before the meeting. At that time, we sit down and talk about what ought to be on the agenda, and he tells me what's been approved so far by his cabinet. His cabinet consists of the four presidents, the president of University of Nevada, Reno, Edd Miller; and the president of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, R. J. Zorn; the president of the Community College System, Charles Donnelly; and the president of the Desert Research Institute, Jack Ward.

These people bring to us the problems that they have that need policy action. They bring to us the problems that require board action—[things] that happen within their particular unit that requires board action. Like, for example, we require that any purchase in excess of five thousand dollars must be approved by the Board of Regents. Promotions are generally made by the

presidents, but they are approved by the Board of Regents. Hirings, and people who leave, and sabbatical leaves—this sort of routine happenings on campus are generally approved by the Board of Regents.

We found out this year that, due to the Adamian case (which I discussed pretty much in depth last year), that the Board of Regents were not covered by insurance under the University policy for someone who might sue them as individuals. We hope to change that. And several of the people who sued us this year did sue us individually. At one time, we had seven suits against the board. A former president of the DRI, Wendell Mordy, sued us. I don't know the legal description of what he said, but he said we were "bad guys," and had done it because of the dislike for him, or personal reasons, rather than for the legitimate reasons for firing him. So he had several suits against us. There was a suit by Dr. Adamian, to change the action of the board, and there was a suit filed by Dr. Richardson, which, incidentally, was settled within the last several days.

Referring to that particular suit—Dr. Richardson had been approved by his peers, by the department heads, and the deans, and the president, who recommended that he be promoted, I believe, from assistant professor to associate professor. So he was approved for that promotion, [but] when it got to the Board of Regents level, we didn't okay it. We said to Dr. Miller, "Take another look at this promotion, and then come back and tell us again if you still feel he should be promoted." There were some questions in the regents' minds. And so he did, and he came back later, and again recommended that Dr. Richardson be promoted. And the regents, at that time, voted not to promote him.

The next thing that happened, I believe, the Faculty Senate, or Lie AAUP, or someone involved with the professors, asked—

[Professor Edmund R.] Barmettler was the man that asked about this. He asked if they could have a chance to talk to me about it, and I said, "Yes." And then Dr. Barmettler asked me if I would come to a meeting on campus of the faculty to explain the reasons why he [Richardson] was not promoted.

Well, we had been advised by our Deputy Attorney General, Dan Walsh, that we should not disclose the reasons, and he was our legal advisor. So we have a policy among board members that once we have made a decision on the way we were going to do it, that's the way it will be handled.

So I told Dr. Barmettler about this, and told him that I couldn't, under those circumstances, answer any questions, but possibly, I could come to listen to them. And then, as I thought about it, you know, that would be a very difficult spot for me to be in, to go and just listen. And since I've been on the Board of Regents the last nine years, that's the only time that I declined to go to a meeting.

I would like to also record this: I did that on my own. That was my decision. It was not a decision of someone else's. That was my decision not to go to that meeting.

At the same time, I invited Dr. Barmettler to come back to a meeting, and if he had something new on the case, or some other questions that he would like us to know about, or to make some more statements, we'd be glad to hear about them; and I invited him to attend the next regents' meeting, which happened to be in Elko. And contrary to what Dr. Barmettler has let the people believe, we did listen to him. He made a presentation, and we did discuss his presentation, and we decided to stay by the advice of our legal counsel.

Dr. Barmettler made, since that time, some rather irresponsible statements—you

know, about how the thing was handled, and that the regents were against the faculty—and they were just irresponsible. They weren't based on fact at all. And that should be recorded.

Then Richardson decided that he would take the case to court, and he hired Paul Bible. And Paul prepared a Case for him. Meanwhile, Procter Hug, Jr., resigned from the Board of Regents and became our legal counsel. And so he and Paul Bible, both of these men put a lot of time in on the case, discussed it, and exchanged ideas back and forth, and finally, they arrived at a solution, which is what happened the last few days. The solution was that Dr. Richardson would receive his promotion, with pay retroactive to the date that he would've gotten it if we had approved it in the first place. And the reason—the main reason that I can see for it—was the fact that we hadn't given him the reasons. But we were—we have been advised that, in most cases, that the reasons should be given if they're asked for.

Now, there was a lot of supposition as to what the reasons were. Some of the supposition is right, but not all of it. But I'm still involved—I was. That's why we got—. Now, let's just leave it go at that. We're going to go by the agreement that was arrived at between our two attorneys.

Ruth G. Hilts: I see. And this is still a private agreement?

Yeah. Well, it's public. It was all in the paper this morning (April 13, 1972) –

What I meant was the reasoning behind it.

Yeah. That's the way it stands now.

I think that in the future we'll alert the regents as to what their status is, and we'll

make them aware that when they do take action, that there is a possibility that the professor concerned may come back and ask why, and that they should be prepared to tell why. And so I know that from now on, when the recommendations come up for promotion or for tenure, that we're going to demand, and ask for, and take a better look at the evidence of why a person should be promoted, and also, look at the reasons why he shouldn't be promoted. I don't believe there's such a thing as a person who has a perfect record. You know, you can't be one hundred percent right all the time. And you certainly can't have one hundred percent of the people behind you. There must be some bad things to say about anyone.

The conjecture was that perhaps Richardson had done something that offended particular regents. This was hinted at in the newspapers, and yet, nothing was ever said. You don't feel that that's the case?

You know, the newspapers sometimes report things as they see them. And this particular story you're talking about, the newspapers reported things as they were, but the story was incomplete. And that's not good reporting. I think they should have the whole story in there. The public gets the wrong assumptions.

Probably one of the biggest highlights, the one that got the most publicity, and the most TV—I was on TV, I believe, eleven days, every day—was when President Miller resigned.

I suppose that you could say that I'm the one that got the whole thing started. I asked at the personnel session if President Miller would stay and excuse the other members, and we'd just sit down and lay the cards on the table. It was my assumption that regents who had complaints or questions or wanted

to get something off their chest would have a chance to sit down, and that President Miller, likewise, if he had some things to say to the regents, we could do it without interruption and really get the problems out in the open and solved.

Now, President Miller agreed to do this, and the two regents, Mel Steninger, and Bill Morris, who had asked for this type of a meeting, [and] I agreed that that's what they would do. But as the meeting progressed, it appeared that we were going to have—you know—we had a request for his resignation right in the meeting, and people were upset, and we were not—well, meeting the goals. We weren't accomplishing what we set out to do. And so I terminated the meeting and suggested, and also promised, at the next session of the Board of Regents, that we would have a personnel session and continue the discussion. In the meantime, people could think about what had happened and get the answers, and Dr Miller could come back again.

Well, that's how it happened. The next day, the story leaked to the press in part, and then when it got to one of the regents, that particular regent clarified it as much as he could. The newspapers gave President Miller such a bad time about the thing that he decided the best thing to do was to resign, provided that he'd been asked to resign by a "substantial minority," the way it came out in the story. It's my understanding that he decided that he would go ahead and resign.

Well, this disturbed me, because I feel that, overall, President Miller has been a good president. There are some legitimate criticisms of the man, but there is much more to be said for his ability as president than there is to be said against him. And here again, I still go by that criteria that no one is one hundred percent perfect.

So I then called an emergency meeting of the Board of Regents to consider his resignation, which was the next thing that should be done. That was called for the following Saturday [November 20, 1971]. So at that meeting, I decided that the best thing to do was to let everybody that had anything to say about Dr. Miller be heard, and to put the meeting on a planned basis.

This was probably the first real test of how to run a regents' meeting that I had. Someone said to me that being chairman of the board was like being a quarterback on a football team [laughing]. Well, the only resemblance is that on a football team, there are eleven people, and there are eleven members of the board. And that's where the resemblance stops. The regents are eleven independent, elected-in-their-own-right people, and some of 'em spent many, many hours and many, many dollars to be elected. And they are a strong group of people. They have to be shown. So I spent several practically sleepless nights planning how this would be run. The decisions were—and I want to give credit to Chancellor Humphrey on this, because he helped me in laying out how we would operate it to be sure that everybody would be heard, and that the right decision came out of it, [a] decision that would really fit what the people wanted and what the regents wanted. So we outlined, right at the beginning of the meeting, what we would do. I asked if it should be a closed meeting. We took a vote. The regents wanted it closed. Then I asked if it was all right with them if we had testimony from certain people. I said I'd like to have it so that we allow fifteen minutes to the faculty, fifteen minutes to the students, and fifteen minutes to the alumni.

But when I talked to [Robert] "Lefty" McDonough, Alumni Association President, he'd discussed it back and forth with his

people, [and] he decided that it would be useless to have testimony from the alumni because there were several different opinions, and he said, "We don't really know who's representative." I suggested to him, then, that since there were five of the eleven members of the Board of Regents who are alumni of the University of Nevada that perhaps we could be representative of the alumni, and he agreed, and so the alumni did not appear. Regent Bill Morris, who is one of the alumni, asked why they weren't there, and when I explained this to him, he accepted [it] that that would be right.

We had one member from the faculty testify, and the students chose to have three people testify for them. It was interesting that one of the ones who testified for them was Mr. Davis, Stan Davis, who was the BSU president. And just prior to that time, President Miller had ordered the thirteen Blacks to be evacuated from that office in the student union building for occupying a public office without authority. And they came to his side. So they— I guess everybody feels that he's fair.

But anyhow, the next thing I pointed out was, after we have the hearings, as such, discuss it among ourselves, that the alternatives are just two—you know, either—if he resigns, or if he doesn't resign. And if he resigns, we need to appoint someone to be the acting president. I had two alternatives—the chancellor had recommended two alternatives for who would be the acting president, and then how he would operate, and how we would select a new president—all these things were outlined. Then, on the other hand, if after we took the vote, and we found out it was small—his [President Miller's] wording was that, "If there is a substantial minority of the regents against me, then I have no alternative but that I should resign." Now, no one knew for sure

what a substantial minority was. A substantial minority. Was that two people? Four people? Five? Five is still a minority. We didn't know. The only way that we were going to find out was to take a vote and call Dr. Miller and tell him what the vote was, and then he should make the decision. Well, as it was, there were two. So he apparently determined that was still a minority, a small minority of the board, and so he elected to stay.

Now, I also told him that if he did elect to stay that what we would do then is call him down and, again, sit down and visit with him and see what he had in mind, and if there were any problem that should be put on the table, it would be put on the table. So that's how we did it. And when the vote was taken, it was two to—I believe there were eight other regents there—two to eight. And so he elected to stay.

Several things came out of it. One of the things that came out of it—the friends of N. Edd Miller recognized that he didn't have any lease on that job as president of the university. His enemies recognized that he was a human being, and that you could talk to him. I think President Miller, himself, recognized that the factions that he needed to listen to included the citizens and the regents, as well as the faculty and the students. That was probably the biggest criticism that he had, that he didn't hear some of the criticisms from the outside as well as he did those from faculty and students. Well, another one [criticism] was that the president's office should not be run by committees. Decisions should be made by the president. But I'm sure that President Miller is a stronger president because of—. I call it an "exercise" that happened that day. And everything's goin' along great at the University of Nevada, Reno, now.

Another interesting point in time was, in September of last year, the Nevada School

of Medicine became a reality. We had selected the students, thirty-two of them; we had our faculty, complete faculty; we had remodeled the Mackay Science Hall so that we would qualify, and we had visits by the people who accredit these type of schools. And on September seventeenth, we had Dr. Wesley [W.] Hall, who is the president of the American Medical Association, and several other dignitaries, come and attend the official opening of the Medical School.

One thing it lacked was that we didn't have the \$300,000 that was pledged by Howard Hughes. So we had to figure out what we were going to do if we didn't get that \$300,000. And we did. We did some rebudgeting and refiguring and transferring, and we had it figured out so we could probably run about five months without the money. And then we didn't know how we were going to handle it from then on. This was such a big problem that, instead of the chancellor, who would have normally recommended transfers, and so forth, I was going to bring this to the Board of Regents and ask them to approve the transfers if it would ever be necessary.

In the meantime, Mr. Wadsworth, who's Hughes' attorney, was very cooperative, kept discussing the amount, and one of the points he made was, "Well, we thought it was going to be a four-year medical school," and there were questions like this that came back and forth. And finally, I made a statement at, I believe, the October meeting that I felt that we would get that money before the November meeting, and it may be on the morning of the November meeting, because that was the ultimatum for the amount. And it was. It was on the morning of the November meeting, which was held in Las Vegas.

When I came through the door, there were photographers there, and there was a man there with a check, and that was Mr.

Wadsworth. The check was for \$300,000. And it'd just be impossible to forget the good feeling that I had in accepting that check, because I knew that [was] one of the best things that ever happened to the University System. The Medical School was the reality that I had written to Mr. Hughes about. We had seen Dr. Fred Anderson's dream come true.

I hope that this will be continued. I'm sure that it will be continued. But I hope it will be for the full \$300,000, year after year. To me, it's a bound contract. When we have some money, that made the contract a reality, but we still have to negotiate each year on the amount of money that we need. So it can vary, somewhere between two hundred and three hundred thousand dollars.

On maybe a little broader look at the whole University of Nevada system, we have, now, got the fourth arm of the University to become a reality, and that is the Community College system. The thing that probably got it going better than anything else was the so-called rebate of slot machine tax. The credit should be given to Bill Swackhamer, a long-time assemblyman from Battle Mountain, and Hal Smith, assemblyman from Las Vegas. These two men put in many, many hours, and they went to Washington and discussed it with our congressmen, and our senators, and Wilbur Mills. And one day, they were able to report that it had become a reality. And no little credit should be given to Neil Humphrey because he was back there, too, working with them and our people.

What this means is that there would be approximately \$5,000,000 that will be available each biennium for the construction of capital improvements, and we hope that it'll all be at the University. Right now, that's what it's intended to do; it's for capital improvements for higher education. The first \$5,000,000 that

we got built the second building on the Elko Community College campus, and it built the first building on the Carson City Community College campus, and it will build the first building on the North Las Vegas Community College campus.

And we did, this year, also (we already selected Elko) select the campus sites for the two community colleges. And this took some promoting, and hearings, and so forth. We had three or four open hearings on each end of the state to discuss where we should put the community colleges. We selected North Las Vegas mostly because the land was there, but secondly, because it's the second largest community down in southern Nevada, and there were many, many potential students there who could benefit by a community college. The Site here in Carson City was selected because, even though it was smaller than Reno, it was still the second largest community, and there was land available. And the second point—a very important point—Was that the citizens of this community, Carson City, were behind it. They put their dollars in, \$50,000 in cash, plus they committed some of their taxes, so there'll probably be about \$30,000 a year for the next three years. And beside[s] that, the organizations, such as the Chamber of Commerce and Rotary, and many, many others, backed it a hundred percent.

There was another reason for having it in Carson that is very important. I, and many of the other regents, and Dr. Donnelly, all agreed that the community college should not be in the same area—immediate area—as the University because it would be in the shadow of the University. It needed to establish its own autonomy as an institution. And we believe this is going to happen in Carson City.

Now, these three community colleges that we have now should carry us for about

ten years. But by that time, we'll probably be selecting another site in northern Nevada, cause that's—I believe the community college is going to grow that way. I've said this publicly many times, and I might as well say it here—I believe that by 1985, there will be more students, or as many students, attending community colleges on a first-year basis, as there will be starting in our two major universities. Because we're going to be offering the kind of an education beyond the high school level that many, many students want and haven't been able to get before. We were the last state to provide this type of education, and so it's going to take a few years for the people to recognize that it's here and what it can do, and to ask for special kind[s] of programs, and so forth. But we're going to be listening to the people to find out what the programs are, and we're going to be telling the students that the programs are there.

Five reasons for having a community college: one, to offer vocational and technical education, which is the first one you think about. The second one, to offer college-parallel courses so that you can—it's like a junior college, so that you can transfer those courses to the University. The third one is public service, because we intend to bring higher education to every community in Nevada of any size. And the fourth one is counseling. We'll be bringing the counseling to all the high schools and to the students. And the fifth one is to actually have a center of higher education in more communities than we have had.

In other words, there'll be a library here [Carson City], and there'll be, maybe, some of the athletic fields, basketball team (we're talking about a basketball team now). These things will be coming with it so that it will make higher education available to people who aren't necessarily trying to get a degree,

who just want to have some continuing education. "Continuing education" is probably the way you would describe that. It's in the community, and they can use the library, and they can take special courses, and we'll put un] these special courses that they require—that the industries, or that the businesses, or the state government, or someone, requires. We'll handle it for them. One of the places we're doing this right now is [at] the prison. We're offering courses out there through the Community College system.

Some of the problems that were really important last year really aren't problems any more. We don't have student demonstrations, and I think there's a better understanding between the faculty and the students and the administration. The minorities seem to be getting many of the things that they're asking for. The communications between them and the powers that be are much better than they were.

We do have a Code of Conduct now. Last year it was the Interim Code of Conduct, but we have one that was written and approved by everyone. We didn't all approve it unanimously, but there's [the] thinking of the students, of the faculty, of administration, and of the regents. They're all involved in that. And this Code of Conduct seems to be working.

We're presently working—and maybe by the next time I make one of these recordings, I can tell you more about it—on the new University Code. Now, I'm not saying it's going to be a *new* code, but it's been a long time since the University Code's been reviewed, changed, and so forth. In the Code, we talk about the authority that the administrators have, how they're selected, and how they act, and what they do, where you go for a decision, and this sort of thing. It's just sort of the guidebook for the operation of a university.

There's thinking of the faculty in there, and there's thinking of the administrators,

and more recently, we're getting the thinking of the regents. We hope to have a new code adopted by—I hope, by May. It may be June. It'll be very soon. But we've been putting a lot of time into that.

The student bodies on both campuses, and also in Western Nevada Community College and in Elko Community College have had their constitutions approved. To restate that— what I really meant to say is this—the constitutions that existed on the four campuses, as they were at that time, were approved by the Board of Regents, and therefore made them part of the official policy of the Board of Regents. I do understand that they are going to propose—at least, on the Reno campus—a new constitution for our consideration. But until that's been approved by the students and brought to us, the one that's now been approved from last year is the one that is sort of the "law" of the students.

We now invite the student body presidents from the two campuses, Las Vegas and Reno, to attend the regents' meetings, and we allow them travel money. We also invite one representative from the community colleges to each meeting, and that representative will be from Elko for meetings in Elko, will be from Reno for meetings in Reno, and will be [from] Las Vegas if that's where it is. If at any time there [is] some particular problem that would especially affect one campus, we're going to invite that particular person to attend one of these, no matter where. This doesn't mean that they wouldn't be able to come—but they would not be official representatives of the Community College system.

It's just like the student body president from Reno is the spokesman for the Reno students. However, if he wants to have someone else speak, then, through him, he can. He can introduce one of the senators, or just a student, whoever he Wants to, and we'll

listen to him that way. It makes for a more regular meeting.

I think we've streamlined our meetings since I've been chairman. We used to have two-day meetings—well, practically every time, and now we've gotten by with one day meetings. One of the reasons for that is that we have asked that the cases for and against, and so forth, on any changes in policy be more specific, and that the recommendations come from the people who are asking for them. That's helped. And then I've held down the debate sometimes, as much as I can. You have to, with eleven people on the board.

Maybe I should at this time just shift a little and tell you what I think about higher education nationally. I've had the privilege of attending several meetings of the Associated Governing Boards, which represents not only the governing boards of all fifty states, but the governing boards of many private institutions. We talk about our mutual problems in panel discussions, speeches, and so forth. One of the best references is the Carnegie study on higher education, Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. This particular commission was appointed by the President to make a study of what the problems were in higher education, where we have been, and where we are now, where we're going to go, the choices, and so forth. And it was the man who had been fired as president of the University of California who was chosen to head up that commission, Clark Kerr. I think he's doing a great job. I didn't always believe in everything that he did as a president, but I think he's doing a great job as chairman of that commission. I'm not saying that everything that they are doing is absolutely right, but they are doing, and that has never been done before. They're really trying to find out what the major problems are.

Let's take a look at some of 'em. Tenure is probably the one that more people talk

about—the man on the street, the guy in the grocery store, your next door neighbor, people at the cocktail parties, the students, the faculty—everybody talks about tenure. 'Most everybody's against tenure. They're not sure why they're against it, but they're against it—except, of course, those people who are tenured professors.

Tenure started out as being the way for people who were in the disciplines like sociology, philosophy, political science—some of those areas—to express their opinions without fear of retaliation by the public. "So if that guy thinks that far off, we'll fire him," and that sort of thing—we believe that you shouldn't do that. Once you've received tenure, you're able to express yourself, and that's sometimes also known as "academic freedom." And specifically, I believe that academic freedom is very important. We have to have it. We never would've gotten this far in our higher education, or in our country, if we hadn't had it—that is, the freedom to express ourselves, just as I am doing right now.

Tenure, itself, the original concept, I think was great because it did protect a man with new and different ideas. It kept him from fearing for the loss of his job, or retaliation because of what he said. Tenure, as it has matured to be, is something different. Instead of being protection to say what you thought, it's become a way to protect your job. It protects the "deadwood." It protects the people who are no longer producing, [but] still at the university. You can't fire a person who has tenure.

I think the real problem is not in tenure, as such. don't think we even have too much of a problem on the way we grant tenure, although about half of the Board of Regents would disagree with me on that. I think the real problem is, how do we fire someone, or demote someone, or keep someone from

getting a raise in pay who has tenure. How do we transfer him? How do we get rid of the one who, instead of using tenure as it was originally set out to do, have used it as a way to reuse their examinations year after year after year, or give the same courses, and not keep up, forget to grow? In other words, I'm saying that a good professor, just like a good anything, he grows, by the years, and by the number of times that he does his job, and the way that he learns about what's happening in the country. In these dramatic times, and fast-moving times, it's very important that someone who is teaching keep up with what's going on. So if he's going to hide behind that and become so-called "deadwood," then he should lose his job, or be demoted, or become a proctor, or something. But you can't do that—and this is one of the frustrations of tenure.

The second point is that when they use tenure to attack the very system that they work in. You know, I don't think that tenure should be a shield to hide behind, so that you can tear down what's going on in a university. Anybody that really wants to be subversive could come to the University, be a very fine boy for four or seven years, or whatever it took to get tenure, follow all the rules, and the next day, could start in and openly do things that would hurt our setup. And we don't need people within the University who are there just to disrupt and to tear apart the things that we're doing.

That is very specifically different from someone who wants to express themselves. I think everybody should have a right to express themselves. But there're some things they can't do, and one of 'em's to tear down the institution, and the other one is to go out, and in the name of the University, make statements. Their own, as individuals, that's their business. And here again, all of

the regents don't think that way. But I do. I think that they should be able to go out and express their opinions at political meetings, and so forth. So that's one of our problems. And it's a national problem that's discussed all the time. One man says, "Well, it's a moot question because we're going to have unions, and once we have unions, why, tenure won't mean anything anymore."

This could happen, you know. We have two chances of it happening now, and the biggest one now is that university professors' association that was just organized. It was organized by some of the leading professors on the University of Nevada, Reno, campus. And I understand that there is a similar movement going on on the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, campus. So maybe that's what's going to happen. We'll, of course, then, probably get into bargaining. (And so we are preparing. I could tell you what we're doing, but I'm not going to at this time.) We are aware of what can happen. And we are aware that when the day for bargaining comes up, that we should be prepared to bargain for the University and for the people of the state of Nevada, and they must decide who's going to do their bargaining. Then, they have people that, as I understand, come in and arbitrate, and so forth.

It's an organization that seems to be the one that's going to be the spokesman for the faculty. [It] is associated with the Nevada Education Association. I am assuming that our discussions will be somewhat similar, except that you're talking about a different group of people—faculty; and people who are working with a principal are—there is a difference. And so we're going to have to understand how this is going to work. That's another ongoing problem that's before us. And this is national, too.

But finally (this is also done by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education),

we're taking a real good look at what we're asking of students in order to give them degrees. Two things are important, I think. One is, in some of the disciplines—and I specifically talk about English, history, philosophy, political science, some of the so-called liberal arts—after you get a degree in four years in one of those areas, you really aren't prepared to go out into the world and do anything except teach. So we're saying that this is great, we want these things to keep on going, but we think that we can, by a process of elimination and concentration, we can offer a baccalaureate degree in three years' time. So there won't be any misunderstanding, I'm not talking about going twelve months out of the year to get the baccalaureate degree. I'm saying that in the usual three year time, for the same amount of requirements that you'd normally get in three years, you would get a degree, a baccalaureate degree in one of those disciplines, and then you go ahead and go into the field you're going into. For example, if you engage in sociology, you'd get your degree in sociology, and then you might spend the next year or two preparing to be a social worker, if that's your area, or if you're going to be a schoolteacher, if that's your area— whichever direction you're going to go. And then in maybe five years, you'd have a master's degree—maybe, even, four years. So we're shortening up the period of time.

Our medical school is probably the best example of this. We've geared ourselves so that if you start out as a premedical student at the University, five years later, you will have completed two years of medical school. And this is going to be a reality very soon. Already—this year—we admitted half a dozen or so juniors into the medical school, so that at the end of five years, they will have gotten that far along.

So we're bringing it along. We're eliminating some of the things we don't think

we need. I, personally, would like to see us eliminate more things than we've done. But we still go back to many, many years ago and require subjects that are not really necessary. Everybody has to have two languages for some degrees—you have to have two years of it, anyhow. And maybe we don't need all those things. So we're questioning, not only here, but nationally, the way that we offer degrees.

Community colleges—not only in our state, but nationally, the community colleges are beginning to educate many, many more of the people who graduate from high school. And that's going to be a continuing thing, as I already predicted. It's going to amaze a lot of people what's going to happen in this state. It's not going to amaze me, 'cause I can see that it's going to happen. I predict that by 1985 we will have as many students starting in community colleges as we will have in the universities.

By shortening their education, do you produce technicians instead of educated people?

Yes, we do, if you're talking about the two years. That's true, you do produce technicians more. But some people don't want to be any more than [that]. They don't want to be "that much" educated. You know, there's two [kinds]—let's take an engineer, for example. There're two kinds of engineers. One kind of an engineer is the one who dreams up bridges and designs them. And then he takes those plans, and he hands them to the other kind of an engineer, who builds the bridges. Now, the man who builds the bridges needs to know how to read the blueprints. He needs to know [what] the man's thinking. But he could care less about— you know, he doesn't want to dream. He's not a designer. So he doesn't need that other higher education. In fact, it bores him to have to take all the requirements before he gets really—. You know, he went to

school to be an engineer. And so after two years' time, and he's been taking English, and math, and all of these things that he had a lot of in high school and more of it now, he's sick, and maybe he quits. And statistics will bear me out in that we have failed in this area.

Another thing that's going to happen—and that is that colleges are not going to grow at the rate that's been projected. I'm not going to be surprised if, one of these days, we're going to count the number of students that enter the colleges, and there's the same number that there were last year, or maybe even a few less than there were last year. And one of the reasons for it is that they're going into community college systems, and another one is that the population's not growing that fast any more. So we don't have to project—the big problem won't be that we don't have enough room.

Another thing is that—nationally, too—the universities are getting out of the dormitory business as much as they can. They're pretty much in there, but there're more and more universities, and all the community colleges, are being designed without dormitories. We're living in a different age than when the kids came from the country and needed to live with other children away from home, and the college was a parent away from home. So this is, nationally, one of the things that's happening.

I'm not saying that all of these things're going to happen all at once, but they are things that we're talking about. And this is why I go to these meetings, and spend several days—four or five days a year—just finding out what's going on otherwise.

Another one that's kind of an interesting one—is offering degrees—external degrees from campus. We require that you go to school right on the campus for fifteen hours the last semester before you can get a degree,

no matter who you are. For example, I had known a schoolteacher down in Smith Valley who can't get her BS degree, or BA degree, whichever one it is, because she hasn't put the time in. She has the hours, but she hasn't put the time in on the campus. And she tried to take some courses on the campus, but, you know, she lives, oh, like eighty miles away, and she has children in school, and so it's impossible for her to get it, until maybe she's too old to do it. So I think we ought to be able to offer external degrees. I have one. My CLU designation from the American College of Life Underwriters in Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania—I've never been there, you know. But I think I got a pretty good education. It was all done by correspondence. Our examinations, however, were all proctored, or watched, and they were all given at the same time nationally. So I think we can do that.

The University of New York, the system, is doing some real experimenting on this, and I think we've got to look into it. I think we ought to be able to allow people to get degrees without being there. Here again, we're going to have some disagreements, especially from the professors on campus. They think that they have to—have to see the students, and the students have to rub shoulders with the professors and other students. I'm not saying there's anything against this, but there are people—and there're many, many of them—who can absorb education without actually being in touch with a university.

They have to have real grit to do it without classrooms because it's harder to work on your Own.

But you don't necessarily need to do that. You were saying that many people won't do it. Is that what you're sayin', that they don't have the determination—?

I'm saying it takes real determination to get it on your own. And that's fine. If they can, and they want to, they should be able to.

So they organize study groups. So they have volunteer teachers. I taught a class in this office with four students, a college level class. And they weren't absent. They came to class. And they passed the examinations. The degree comes back—we still follow the rules and the requirements, and so forth. So this is an area that we're really talking about in higher education.

Another [thing] that I am particularly interested in is the role of the regent. Now, [when] I became chairman of this board, I conducted a series of classes—I guess they were classes—of the regents, telling them what the role of a regent was, and more specifically, what the role of a University of Nevada Regent is. We have four new regents, brand new regents, and one had only been on a short period of time. I am hoping that, in the next couple of sessions, we will be able to sit down and have some more informal discussions. I explained to them what a regent does, and how to tell the difference between administrative problems and problems that we're supposed to be taking care of, the policy-making problems. We're a policymaking board, and we try to get that clear. I've explained how we delegate authority, and how we expect the people who have that authority to follow through, and how to handle telephone calls and questions.

I think that regents should be individuals, and I think that they should, when they have an opportunity to make a public speech, make one. I'd say I have averaged at least three speeches or public appearances a month since I've been chairman of the board. I don't have any set speech that I give, either. I have written many of them just to fit the particular group

that I was talking to. And I think it's good, 'cause when you're talking to an individual regent, you get some insight into what a regent really is. I think we have not been good public relations people. Few people know what our role is.

Nationally, this is a problem. The regents don't understand what they're supposed to be doing. The administrators have taken over many of the duties that belong to the regents, and then, when it came time to act in making the decisions, they reneged on the responsibility that they got with it. And then the faculty have lost respect for the boards of regents. The legislature has bypassed the regents and dealt directly with other people. In some states, they have three boards, or five boards. For example, when I say three boards, they have a board for the junior colleges, and they have a board for the state colleges, and they have a board for the universities, state universities. And each one makes up its own mind, and they all three go to the legislature. So who do you suppose is the highest board on higher education when it comes to the state legislature? And some of them have their community colleges and the junior colleges involved on the county level, just like their high schools are. And here again, how do you get the financing? If you do that, you've got to get your financing from that area.

Well, I believe that we really have the ideal method of operating a university. The regents are not—well, they're not tied to any particular governor who appointed them; they didn't get appointed because they were the president of a big corporation that might give some money to the University, or they, themselves, were personally wealthy. And the regents are responsible to the voters every four—or, it's going to be six—years, which I think is a good thing. The people recognize that they elected those people, and we have

got it so that the people know the regents better than they used to know them, and they recognize that—[if] they're going to have a voice in what's going on at the University, they have to find out who the regent is, and elect the right person. I believe that we have a much more democratic way of operating.

We also are an independent body that acts as a buffer between the legislature and the University. We absorb an awful lot as regents, absorb a lot of misinformation, pressure, and so forth. Everybody doesn't recognize this. But when the faculties have real problems, they stop with us. And so they can express themselves, get their problem straightened out, and not make some legislator who's appropriating the money mad at 'em.

Then, on the other hand, we turn right around and represent the University [in] asking (the legislature) for money for higher education at the University of Nevada. Our chancellor is the spokesman. We always call on the presidents and anybody else that's involved. But we go there having hashed over the real problems and decided whether it's more important to have a building in Las Vegas, or to buy some land for the community colleges, or— you know— whatever problem's most important, as far as capital [improvement's] concerned. Also, about the administration, the operation, who needs the most? should we provide new teachers? what new courses? That's all decided by the regents. Then we go to the legislature, and we can say to them, "We're elected officials, too" And we can say to them, "We've taken a good look at this, and this is what we feel ought to be done." And it's much better. You don't become a political football. And I've talked to some regents from other systems. Their problems are real. There've been studies done, but no one's offered a solution that's as good as, or certainly, not one better than the

one we have. Part of our success comes from the fact that we took a real good look at our administration five years ago, and reorganized it, set up the four presidents, with a chancellor system.

Then [a comment on] teacher evaluations and course evaluation: Professors have been sort of up on a pedestal— you know. Once you've got to the point—. Don't misunderstand me. It's hard to get to be a professor. Well, once you get to be a professor, then you're set up on a pedestal, and you go in your room, and you decide what you're going to lecture on, and what the course is going to be about, and the students take it whether they like it or not. Well, that's sort of the attitude we had. The dean couldn't go in and sit in on a class, nor could the president, or one of the regents—you didn't do it. Maybe you could have, but you didn't do it, 'cause that would be an affront to the professor. The students weren't allowed to really say what they thought about the teachers, and so the evaluations were more or [less] abstract. You couldn't put your finger on what they were— how you evaluated how good a teacher was. You're not looking to see how his students came out, and things like that. Maybe the students would've done just as well without the course. It's hard to determine.

So the students, themselves, asked for a chance to evaluate the teachers, and the regents thought it was a good idea. And so we appropriated money on both campuses to allow the students to make this evaluation. The students have questionnaires that they have set up. And they talk about the professors and the courses. They say, "What do you think about that particular course?" The student is allowed to say what he thought about the course and what it did for him. Then he's also asked, specifically, questions about the professor. "Was the professor professional in

his work?" "Was he on the job all the time?" "Was he late for class?" "Was he an absentee type of professor?" "Was he able to get the story across? Could they understand what he was talkin' about?" "Was there enough feed-in from the students?" and these sort of questions. They're all in the questionnaire.

We think this is going to be a real valuable tool for the professor, himself, if he really wants to improve himself, such as I do in my business. I do a self-evaluation every day. He'll be glad to have somebody else's opinion of how good he is and what he's doing wrong so he can use it. And it will also help the people who have to evaluate these people when we decide whether we're going to give 'em a merit raise, or keep 'em, or [give them] tenure, and so forth. It's going to be a tangible sort of a way of finding out how effective—really effective—the professors are. And I'm sure we're going to keep this.

Courses—the same thing. I think we ought to be teaching courses now that have to do with the way people live in China. I think we ought to be teaching the Chinese language, and maybe this I also true with Russia. I'm not so sure that it's very important to teach French any more. There're going to be jobs for people who are knowledgeable about China and Russia. That's one of the reasons you go to school, is to get into your profession or your job. Whatever it is, it's spelled in a four-letter word, w-o-r-k, work. And work shouldn't be something that's tedious and hard to do; it should be something that you enjoy. And so, if you're well equipped to do what your work is, then you're going to enjoy it more. That's the way I feel about it. Now, if there's going to be somebody that's going to get a job going over to deal with the Chinese—if this is going to happen, and it appears that it's going to—it's going to be those who know how to speak the language and understand something about

China. It's not going to be somebody with a four-year degree in Greek history.

So we want relevant courses. We are making some steps, but we're making them very slowly. I have mentioned this, and other regents mentioned it, but we just aren't getting the professors to move fast enough toward improving themselves, and toward improving the courses that they offer. I'm sure that our professors are behind on keeping up with the relevancy of courses, the requirements that students have to have, and—I'm not speaking of all of the professors. But generally, there is much to be said for making our courses more relevant to the needs of today, to the way we're living today. We're in a space age. We're in an age where Red China's reached its maturity, and it's one of the world powers, and we should recognize that. I'm sure that if we could gear our people to being able to take those kind of jobs, to be able to understand how the Chinese work, and their language, that they're going to have a better chance of reaching employment.

We can talk about profession, and education, and degrees, and all that, but what we're really trying to do is prepare ourselves to go to work, w-o-r-k, work. If we understand what we're doing, we'll like it, and it really won't be work at all. It won't be the tedious thing. So our professors must understand this, and this is one of the things we want them to do. That's why I'm particularly interested in the evaluation of courses and teachers.

Another area where there's been much public discussion, and where there's public interest, is in our athletic program. I believe it's three years ago, now, we joined a new conference. We'd stepped out of the Far Western Conference and went into the Western Collegiate Athletic Conference. This new conference consists of bigger schools, schools like Santa Clara, and schools where

the competition is much tougher than it was in the old Far Western Conference.

One of our competitors is—is each other; in other words, University of Nevada at Las Vegas and the University of Nevada at Reno are both in the same conference. We started football at UNLV three years ago. This'll be our third year coming up now, and we've had some pretty good teams already. We hired a new football coach at the University of Nevada two years ago, and he's building his team up. I think that this year, we're going to see, in football, that both teams will be doing a good job, minimal job. We'll be winning at least as many games as we lose. Maybe more.

Basketball's given us some problems at the University of Nevada, Reno, this year. I think maybe our coach stayed on a little too long, and the recruiting wasn't the best. We lost some of the players, and we didn't win any games, and there was a lot of downtown complaints about it. We just recently hired a new man. I'm not sure what his name is, but he was the coach at Cal. He comes from the big league, and maybe we can look forward to some real good basketball on the Reno campus. At Las Vegas, however, we've done very well. We've played against some of the top teams all over the country. They have a man by the name of Bayer down there that's coach of basketball at this time. And— they have a good Boosters Club.

We were able to raise money so now we have [enough for] both ends of the state that we didn't used to have—for athletics; not as much in northern Nevada as I'd like to see raised, but if you consider the population, I guess it's good. I think that once we get more winning teams with both of them, football and basketball, then, we'll be able to do it.

One of the problems that bothers me—and maybe it's always been around, but we didn't pay much attention to it— is that we

aren't putting any emphasis at all on women's athletics. And I think we should. I think there's much to be said for the argument that the women do pay their fee every year, an athletic fee, and it's not that they always should be sitting out watching the game. I think we ought to have a way of spending some of that money to help our women athletes, particularly in things like tumbling and gymnastics and skiing and tennis, and many of the areas where we have some very fine coeds that we should be sponsoring and paying more attention to. We really aren't doing that to the extent that we ought to. Maybe that's going to have to be done by an increase in fees—I don't know how it'll have to be done. One of the things it's going to have to have is the backing of the students and the people downtown. They're going to have to understand that all of the money isn't to be used for so-called—what do you call it—"audience participating," where you watch big football teams, and all. I kinda like to watch women's athletics. We took the time off and went up and saw Billie Jean King up at Lake Tahoe, when she was there, a tennis player, and the rest of them. It was interesting. They're good, women athletes. And we just haven't recognized it.

I noticed that the new student body president, Rick Elmore, says that he would like to see the student body have the decision-making that they had regarding the athletic fees. I don't know if that'll come to pass or not. It took so long, six or eight months, for the students to finally arrive at no decision, and the regents had to make the decision. So that probably won't happen. They should be there in an advisory capacity; I'm sure of that. But probably, it should be designated as it has been. Things have quieted down since that happened.

The students should be considered, and they should be involved when we talk about

things like the band, and the coaches, but also, the people who contribute money, scholarships, for band members and football players and basketball players, and so forth, should have some consideration.

We're making a study on both campuses of how we should separate the P. E. department from the athletic department. Problems like the one we talked about a while ago—tenure—came up. You can't give anybody tenure as a basketball coach, you know, so you have to give 'em tenure in the P. E. department, if that's what we're going to do, if we're going to give them tenure. Maybe we shouldn't give them any tenure at all.

On the other hand, maybe they should be separated because one of them is an intercollegiate sport where we're out there to win, to make a name for the school. You know, it's kind of public relations; they have a special job to be done, where the P. E. department could care less about it. They want to get the children and the young people in good physical shape so that they'll live longer and do a better job at what else they do in life. There're two different reasons for the two departments, and maybe they should be separated. So we're discussing that on both campuses.

We're also talking about athletic programs in the community colleges. I don't know how much involved we'll get in it, but we do have a basketball coach in Elko, and we have one here [Carson City]. I'm not sure—I think we're going to have one in Las Vegas, too. So they'll be competing, playing against high schools, and maybe other junior colleges, and so forth.

Last year when I became chairman of the board, I thought that it would be good to make a statement of what I stood for, and what would probably be the philosophy of my tenure as chairman of the board. And it went something like this:

In all my wildest dreams, I never thought that I would someday be the chairman of the Board of Regents. I recognize that it is a great honor, and I approach it, certainly, with a degree of apprehension, and yet eagerly, looking forward to the challenge. Our responsibility is clearly set out in the constitution of the state of Nevada. We are responsible for all education beyond the high school level. We have in the past delegated our authority to the chancellor, to the presidents of the two sister universities, to the director of DRI, and to the director of the community colleges. This delegation of authority continues downward to anyone given administrative assignments.

(As an aside—the director, the title of the DRI president, and the directors of the community colleges have been changed to presidents since this statement.)

During my tenure of office, I shall insist that not only do we delegate authority, but also, the responsibility that goes with it. I see this board as the final authority as a policy making body. I cannot see us as being involved in administrative decisions so long as they are responsible and representative of the thinking of the Board of Regents. When they are not, I feel it is our duty to relieve the particular administrator of his duties. I believe that I and the members of this board have been receptive to new ideas, many of which have become the policy of the University system. On the other hand, we have not always gone along with recommendations. I see the Regents' handbook as a living document. We live by policies as they are set up, but we recognize that they are imperfect, and we will change if we can be shown that the change is necessary. I am for change if needed and indicated, but I am not for change just for the sake of change.

I appreciate this great challenge and the responsibility you have given me. I look to

the other Regents, the administration, the faculty, the students, and the people of the state of Nevada for new ideas and support of this great University system.

I believe that we must insist on academic integrity in our teachers. This includes such virtues as judgment based on facts, honesty, responsibility, and knowledge and love of their subject, rational behavior and pride in our Universities and all that they stand for.

I believe that we have the responsibility to provide facilities and people capable of offering first-class education beyond the high school level. This includes all of our young people, those who seek the baccalaureate degree, and those who seek the associate degrees. The University system is for our young people. It should provide the kind of education that best fits their needs. I believe that we must hear these young people, so we should encourage them to tell us what they are thinking. We should make every effort to improve communications both ways. We must insist, however, that students recognize the rights of others, that they recognize what a great privilege they have in being one of our students. They must recognize that they have a very special right to a higher education, that that right exists because our respect for the rights of others. In conclusion, I want to thank you all for your confidence in me. I know that I will follow three outstanding men. I am privileged to have you all still on the board. I shall look to everyone concerned—students, faculty, chairmen, and Regents—for their ideas and support in the years ahead.

As long as we're quoting—I've been introduced to talk at many, many clubs and organizations and conventions, and so forth, and after a while, you get so you hear 'em sayin' the same thing as last year, over and over, "You graduated from the University in 1941, you were born in Elko, Nevada, lived

here all your life, and you're elected..." and all these things. So I decided that maybe it might be a little different to have a different kind of introduction. So I, in my own words, defined a university regent as I see a university regent. And this is the way it goes:

A university regent is a public servant who serves without pay at all times, and he must serve God without offending the devil. He must serve the taxpayer without offending the faculty and administrators. He must serve the alumni without offending the football coaches. He must serve the faculty and the students without offending the public. He must approve a budget that satisfies the faculty and the students, and is welcomed and endorsed by the governor and by the state legislature. He is expected to make no decisions without first consulting with the faculty, the students, and the public, and if he is right, the credit goes to the administration, or to the faculty, or to the student. And if he is wrong, no question but what the blame goes to him. The press sees him as a secretive, biased, uncommunicative, extremely conservative enemy. Let me assure you that in reality, a regent is a warm, imperfect, sincere human being. He serves because he has a sincere desire to work with and for our young people, and/or because he has a desire to repay, in part, his alma mater.

CENTER FOR RELIGION AND LIFE

JOHN P. MARSCHALL, DIRECTOR

John P. Marschall: I'm Dr. John P. Marschall, one of the directors of the Center for Religion and Life, and also a lecturer in American history at the University of Nevada.

The first item that I want to address myself to is the relationship of religious groups to the campus and the Jot Travis Union, in particular. Over the past couple of years, there has been a problem of certain religious groups using the University facilities for organizational meetings, publicity for their particular groups. And sometimes, this has meant that the Jot Travis Union has been almost completely dominated on a regular basis by particular religious groups who use that facility for what could be construed as proselytizing.

As a result of many groups—or several groups, at least—using the publicity facilities—that is, the bulletin boards, the showcase in Jot Travis Union, some of the rooms, some complaints were leveled to the authorities at the Union, which resulted in some questions being asked of the Attorney General about the relationship of religious groups to a state university facility.

The questions were asked at a time that the University's attorney was a temporary appointment. Mr. Tom Bell was the University's attorney at that time. And he set down a ruling that wasn't publicized until Mr. Procter Hug, Jr. was already the new appointment as University attorney. Therefore, the ruling that was made—that I'll refer to in a moment—never has really been promulgated.

The ruling, as I understand it, which was never promulgated, was that all religious groups of any denomination may not use university facilities of any kind—that includes bulletin boards, rooms, and so on—for any purpose whatsoever because the understanding was that if a religious group is using it, even if it's a student religious group, that was a violation of the Nevada constitution covering matters of church and state.

From my perspective, the problem was complicated by the fact that our relationship—the Center for Religion and Life's relationship with the University—has always been a cooperative one, where we have never asked to use university facilities, but we have

occasionally used bulletin boards—or, I would say, regularly used bulletin boards, and used university mails to publicize nondenominational, nonproselytizing activities. The Center has also been a place where many university classes have been held for want of space on campus, and, during the past year, the regents have also met at the Center, although the regents have rented the Center space. So it's clearly not a gratuitous gesture on our part. It's been a clear rental.

Now, one of the distinctions that I felt should have been made by the Attorney General's office that I am not sure has been clearly made, is the difference or the distinction between a religious denomination or a religious group that uses university facilities for strictly proselytizing purposes, trying to get people into their organization, trying to increase the number of adherents to a particular religious point of view, the distinction between that and what is clearly the Center's philosophy, of really trying to avoid any kind of proselytizing, not having an organization, encouraging people indirectly to be a part of whatever religious denomination they want to be a part of. But the Center, itself, is not a proselytizing organization. The kinds of activities that we have at the Center clearly avoid that, and we try to have activities that are geared to helping people search for meaning in their own lives—workshops, and communications. It's true there are theology lectures, but these are by Protestant moral theologians, or Jewish rabbis, or Roman Catholic priests who come out of the ecumenical center at the University of California at Berkeley, so that the focus has been rather consistently ecumenical.

Therefore, when the Attorney General's ruling came down, it ruled out a 12 religious organizations. The Center fell under that umbrella. And it frankly hasn't changed our

relationship with the University one whit, I think, because there has been kind of an understanding of the distinction that I have just made. And my guess is that the original judgment made by the Attorney General's office will pass into desuetude; that is, it will never be enforced. There'll be an understanding that proselytizing groups may not use campus facilities. The nonproselytizing groups may—with permission of the University officials.

Just in passing, I might mention that the Center has continued to be a co-sponsor of University Community Relations seminars, which continue to be held at the Center in conjunction with Dean Basta's University Community Relations office on campus. And, like last year, this year, the participants in those seminars are going to be a part of a major forum for University and off-campus personnel which will be held in May, which will be called the Governor's Day Forum, the topic of which will be "Academic Freedom and Tenure (which continues to be a bugaboo).

A third topic that I would like to address myself to is the BSU sit-in. A great deal of publicity surrounded this event. I happened to be out of town when the news first broke, that the Black students were going to do something to try to find space for organizational use. And as others could probably say, there was a good bit of emotion on both sides, whether any particular ethnic group ought to have its own particular office, or whether exceptions should be made for Blacks, or Indians, or Spanish-Americans, because of particular cultural difficulties that they've had.

That issue never seems to have been resolved. And on a particular Wednesday evening at the ASUN Senate meeting, that was the day that I happened to come in town, and when I heard about the difficulty, TJ offered, in the name of the Center, temporary space at the Center that could be used by the BSU

until such time as the ASUN or the University provided some space either for that particular group or for any number of ethnic groups.

However, that evening, there was a confrontation between a large number of Black students and other white students from other colleges on campus, in which both Blacks and whites taunted each other, and challenges were laid at each other's door, and resistance hardened on the part of the Black students so that they felt at that point, by Wednesday night—since they were being challenged with words like, “If you try to sit in or move into an office, we're goin' to—we students are goin' to make sure that you don't stay there,” the Black students at that point couldn't back down. It made it impossible, then, for them to accept the offer of the Center for temporary space. The issue was now much broader than office space. It was a challenge to Black identity, and power, and everything else.

As a result of that confrontation on that Wednesday evening, the Blacks did take over an office, and I won't go into the details of this. I was asked to be a faculty marshal, I was also a liaison between the Black students in the office and the police, campus police, and there was an understanding that I was to communicate between the Black students and the police.

During the private conversations with the Black students in the office, before it was bolted shut, I was with Mr. Mike Lane. The understanding of this—the questions that the students were asking was, “Is this only a misdemeanor?” And we were able to assure the students that as long as there was no resistance and no violence, that their sitting in this office was a misdemeanor only. They assured us, and asked us to tell the police, that there would be no resistance, that they would go peacefully and quietly, and they had no

intention of doing anything more than having sat in the office, and they wanted to be asked to leave.

There was another question that was raised by them. It seemed—and there was some confusion all the time. Some Black students were not sure whether they wanted to be in that room after it was closed or not. Many of them perhaps were thinking about other misdemeanors that were on their record and how this would affect their future at the University. I would say that many of the students were clearly frightened. I heard one student say to another, “Man, do you realize how close you are to dying?” That's the kind of emotional pitch that existed in that room before the door was bolted shut, because they frankly didn't know whether the police were going to be able to handle it. They had received threats from groups of white students that if the police didn't, that the white students would storm the office and there would be a brawl.

Shortly afterwards, several of the students said that they wanted to make sure that their rights were read to each of them individually. The police agreed to do this. I was then asked to leave, Michael Lane was asked to leave, the door was bolted shut from the inside, some desks were put against the door, and then a period of confusion existed, which was followed by President Miller reading to the students a statement about their having to get out, and I'm not going to go into all the details. The faculty marshals were there in the foyer just outside the ASUN office. The building eventually was cleared after perhaps an hour. The students were let out, but only after the door had been pried open, and some form of gas, or—. Mace was used.

And there again, there's a question that I never quite got resolved in my own mind. I saw the Mace being used. At the same time,

I saw smoke coming out (what appeared to be smoke coming out) from under the office door just at the time the Mace was used. It was a confusing moment for me, as an observer, and I daresay, for the police, and probably for the students who didn't know exactly what was happening as that door opened. I learned later that the students used a fire extinguisher, and that gave the appearance of smoke. But there was very little resistance, if any. The students filed out. It was only later that I found out that several students had left the room through a trap door in the ceiling, and escaped over the roof.

My involvement in that particular event ended at that point. There never was a similar request to ask for space because the ASUN president at that time, Dan Klaich, said that he was working on trying to fix up a room for not only the Black Student Union, but for other ethnic groups.

Our relationship—or my personal concern, I guess—for the Blacks on this campus has been one of trying to find ways of helping them to develop their own responsible leadership without being patronizing on the one hand, or totally irresponsible, myself, on the other hand, by not being concerned about their welfare.

I would like to make an editorial comment about the whole issue of [office] space. My guess is that the question of an office was a kind of pseudo issue. There comes a time, both on campus and in the minds and hearts of students at various times in the course of a year, where certain incidents, or certain situations take on proportions far beyond their importance, take on an importance far beyond what it should have, I should say. And the fact that the issue of space has not come up again since leads me to believe that it was not the issue. But it also leads me to believe that those people who think it was the issue

have to look more clearly and carefully at the relationship of Blacks and whites on this campus, and all kinds of similar small things that continue to rub Black students and white people the wrong way. I think, that just because things seem to be “quiet,” that that's no reason to be apathetic or lethargic about trying to see what the problems are—not just for Black students on this campus, but for students at large.

My guess is, as I look at the campus—and here, I'm getting into a fourth, more general area—is that definitely, we're going through a period of anomie, goallessness, on the part of students in general. The job opportunities are less this year. People are more aware of that. A lot of students are disenchanted with national foreign policy in spite of their involvements in peace organizations, and whatever. They seem to feel that no matter what they do, no difference is going to be made at the national levels. Some students have responded to this by getting more deeply involved in government, voting registration, preparing themselves for jobs in the legislature, working with the state legislature. Others have dropped out completely from the political scene, from peace organizations. Many of them have tried to find solace in small communal groups, both on campus and off. Some have just decided they don't care what's going to happen. I know an increasingly large number of students this year have thought seriously about dropping out of school temporarily to take a year or two off, either traveling to Europe or reading the things that they had always wanted to read, and then coming back to school after they put their lives and their goals together a bit more clearly. And I think the lack of job opportunities has contributed to that sense of goallessness.

One of the ways, I think, that students have tried to find “handles” in their own

lives in the past year that's different from any previous year is identifying with certain religious movements. Two of them that I can think of that are beginning to emerge on this campus are, one, Pentecostalism, and second, the "Jesus movement." They're two distinct movements, and I'm not going to go into the theological distinctions. I would say that the Jesus movement is much stronger on campus among students. There are a number of young people who have been coming into town over the past year who are not any longer collegians. They're of college age, they have dropped out of the drug scene, and are identifying now with a particular Jesus-oriented group. There was a communal group—several communal groups in town that were here during the past academic year who have since left. For reasons that I do not know. I have been told that the hottest movement on the University of California, Berkeley, campus this academic year is the Jesus movement. It would be an overstatement to say that that's true on the University of Nevada campus. But my best guess is that we have yet to see the emergence of the Jesus movement on this campus. y that, I mean I think it is yet to come. It's growing very quickly. As a matter of fact, I think it's been documented that the Jesus movement is the fastest growing religious movement anywhere in the country.

Now, I have some personal biases based on some observations about the Jesus movement in general. As a theologian, I know that the theology, the rational basis for religion among people who are in the Jesus movement, is very shallow. It's a very shallow theology, based largely on a literal, unscientific interpretation of scripture. However, when a person, young or old, lacks goals, lacks authorities, or doesn't have authorities that he can trust, it's a very easy move, a very easy step, to latch onto

anything, whether it's the scriptures, or a demagogue, or whatever. And I think the scriptures serve that kind of purpose. They serve the purpose of providing someone with a handle, a direction, that cannot, in any way, be challenged.

Within the Jesus movement, there is a strong anti-institutional bias. Most of the people who are in the movement have written off the traditional churches and traditional institutional churches. I think this is part of a revolt against bureaucracies, against institutional ways of getting things done.

Another observation I've made is that people in most groups that call themselves Jesus groups tend to be involuted; that is, they tend to be turned in on themselves. Their main goal is in drawing others to their group, to get others to become converted, to be spirit-filled, or to be converted. And there is not as strong a sense of social concern, or social consciousness, about poverty, or war, or peace, or oppression, or changing laws in the legislature, which, for me—and this is where I reveal my bias— is a weakness within the Jesus movement.

I think, finally, I can say that those students whom I have met who have come off the heavy drug scene onto what I might call, for want of a better word, a "Jesus kick," or a "scripture kick," they've merely replaced one hangup with another. And I have many reservations about the long-term effect on the lives of these young people. I'm speaking now particularly of those who have moved from drugs to the Jesus movement. My role as a counselor leads me to believe that there are underlying reasons why a young person would get on drugs, and there is a certain kind of substitutionalism that's going on here, without getting at underlying psychological reasons why a person might want to escape from the world.

Ruth G. Hilts: That percentage would you say, of the student body, is involuted, compared to those who are actively concerned with their student government and government in general?

Well, I'd like to make a distinction. I think at the far ends of the spectrum—both ends of the spectrum—there are activists. Within the Jesus movement, I would call those students activists. But they are involuted. By that, I mean they are actively trying to get people to join their organization, to be converted, and whatever. They're very actively involved in that movement. And they are not particularly concerned, as I mentioned, about legislative changes, and that sort of thing, changes within the University policy.

At the other end of the spectrum, I think I would say that there are a large number of students who don't have any particular interest in any kind of traditional religious value. They're not part of the Jesus movement or Pentecostalism. But their primary focus, as university students, is to find ways of exercising responsibility for changing the world around them. And in some ways, that has become a "gut level" religion for them. At least, they feel in their insides that they have a kind of religious purpose, that there is some association between changing laws and doing a godly thing. But I don't think that's explicit in their thinking.

The the middle—and this would be the vast majority of students—and I'm talking about the ninety percent in the middle—of the remaining ninety percent, I would say that probably thirty percent are very actively involved in pursuing studies and are degree-oriented. They have a clear notion of what they want to do when they get out of school— or, at least they think they do. The remaining sixty percent in that ninety would be people who

are struggling with their own identity. They are beginning to feel a sense of independence, for the first time away from home, they're not sure if they're going to stay in school, they're not particularly active in pursuing their studies. They may not even be particularly active in pursuing the frat scene, or the sorority scene, or the athletic scene. It's that sixty percent that I would consider to be in a kind of state of limbo, or apathy, or goallessness.

I want to say that those guesses on percentages are guesses. They're informed guesses, but I have no statistical data with which to back them up.

Maybe I could clarify the changing—something that's changed in the past year. Two or three years ago, those people who were involved in the Jesus -movement or in fundamentalist religious movements could've been found among the peace societies, whether on this campus or off. More recently, off this campus, for example, in California, I see the people involved in the Jesus movement and in Pentecostal movements urging those marchers for peace, or those who are trying to make changes in the legislature—the Jesus people are trying to tell them, "No, that's not the way to go. Just accept Jesus as your Lord and Saviour, and that will solve the world's problems." That's one of the changes that I see going on right now in 1972.

Last December, the Faculty Senate passed a resolution calling for the organization of an athletic program study committee—that is, a committee that would study not the PE department, but the intercollegiate athletic program, its relationship to the goals of this University, the effect of the athletic program upon students, student participants and nonparticipants, and its effect on the civic community at large.

About a month and a half later, I was approached by the chairman of the Faculty

Senate, Hugh Mozingo, and asked if I would chair that committee. After a good bit of soul searching, recognizing that this was a very delicate issue, and that any kind of study, no matter how deep it went, would never satisfy anyone, I did agree to accept the chairmanship. And serving with me on that committee are Alex Boyd, who is a counselor in Special Services; Ann Cattelain, who is a professor in Home Economics; Dr. Kenneth Loeffler, who is in the School of Business; Mr. Ken Carpenter, from the Library; Dr. John Malone, from the school of Agriculture; and myself, seven of us who are active, voting members of the committee. There are two other appointees who are consultants, Mr. Henry Hattori, who's Controller of the University; and Dr. Edwin Dodson, who is from the School of Education. There is a third consultant to be appointed this week, Dr. Rebecca Vreeland, who will be a technical consultant if the committee should choose to do some survey research.

The committee has met almost weekly, ever since about the middle of February. The purpose of the original meetings was to identify goals and scope of the committee's study, and the understanding so far, among the members of the committee, is that each member of the committee would solicit questions from whoever had an interest in the intercollegiate athletic program, questions that had to be resolved or answered in order to clear the air. The committee agreed that it would study bibliographical materials privately, studies that had been [made] of intercollegiate programs and their relationship to other university goals that were available in print. Secondly, the committee would interview any and all people who were directly or even remotely associated with the intercollegiate athletic program. And finally, if there were time and money available,

the committee would sponsor some kind of survey research to determine the attitudes of a wide variety of people, both on and off campus, the attitude of people toward the intercollegiate athletic program.

At the present time, we have interviewed about fifteen people. Included among the interviewees has been President Miller and Dean [Harold L.] Kirkpatrick. At the present time, I would prefer not to identify other people who have been interviewed.

Last week, last Thursday in the Gazette, there was a brief statement concerning the functioning of this committee, and I regret to say, a misleading quotation, presumably attributed to me, in which it was stated that those interviewed have shown a great deal of misunderstanding of the athletic program. I would like to clarify that statement by saying it's not from the interviewees that that kind of information has come, but rather, that the committee, itself, reels that there is a good bit of misunderstanding and misinformation that has to be clarified.

I could elaborate on any one of these topics. There are certain matters, particularly with respect to the intercollegiate athletic program study, that I'm not at liberty to speak about at this time. But it may be possible a year from now for me to elaborate more on that topic.

CODE COMMITTEE

PROFESSOR ROBERT M. GORRELL, CHAIRMAN

Robert M. Gorrell: I'm Robert Gorrell, of the Department of English, and here, I guess, as chairman of the [Faculty] Senate committee on the code.

Probably the code committee work has had more interest the last year or two—mainly because of a variety of events that are not really related to the code committee. One of them is the shift in the whole national situation, as far as employment of faculty goes. Whereas as recently as two years ago the market was highly in favor of the professor—the young man could finish his Ph.D. and hope to go to a good place at a relatively high salary, with a relatively low teaching load, and probably at the rank of assistant professor—and very suddenly, the whole market has shifted so that now one finds two and three hundred applicants for a single job, just as he did fifteen or twenty years ago. This has been part of a considerable change, nationally, in the whole problem of faculty-administration relations, I think.

And then, I think this has been reflected locally, in relations between the Board of

Regents and the faculty, in particular. Part of it, of course, was started off by activities a year ago, of members of the faculty which the regents picked up as being detrimental to the future of the University, and which caused some very strained relations between the faculty and the board. Then perhaps a third kind of local factor has been the shift from the single university to a university system. Although that took place several years ago, the University's code has never been revised in order to accommodate it to this new system. And the major activity this year on the code has been the creation of a systems code; and since this is a relatively new concept, it's brought about a number of conflicts which I might mention.

The first thing, though, probably, that's more interesting on the code thing, is the development a year ago of the so-called conduct code, or...What is it called? the rules for—' It started as an interim code, and then it became a permanent code, and it has an elaborate title, Rules and Disciplinary Procedures for Members of the University

Community, which includes the regents by name, the “university community” does. But that grew very clearly out of alleged bad behavior on the campus, and the difficulties that led up to that illustrated really pretty clearly, I think, the kinds of problems that can develop between faculty and lay administration who are outside. Because in all of these instances, I’m quite sure that the actual behavior was totally different from the reasons that caused the distress of the Board of Regents. That is, in almost every instance, the Board of Regents were picking up from newspapers, or from hearsay, or from a small part of the evidence, a pretty much biased opinion of what had actually gone on. That’s probably not true in the Adamian case, since some of them were present; but in others, they were listening to little bits of hearsay, and much of the faculty resentment against personnel activities and the Board of Regents has been a tendency for board members to pick up a relatively small point and make some kind of issue of the small point without considering all of the faculty concerned, or the whole salary problem.

In one instance, for example, this was a graduate student in English who was accused after the Governor’s Day activities of using obscene language in class, which, I guess, is regarded as a crime. And he denied that he had done so. Some of his students used obscene language in class, which they do with some frequency, I suppose—or, at least they do outside class. But anyway, he denied this. It was investigated quite thoroughly. An attorney for the regents checked the evidence and recommended that there was nothing to the charge, and he was all cleared, so that the president recommended that all charges be dropped, that there was no basis for any charge. But the kid was then prohibited from teaching, even though it was all clear. Still,

in the backs of their minds, “We’ve got to be careful about this.”

I’m going into all this only because, along with the Adamian case (which is still pending in court, of course), [it] did cause two kinds of concern, I think, in the Board of Regents—one, a genuine concern for what they considered conduct among faculty members that was not in the best interests of the University, particularly, not in the best interests of getting appropriations from the legislature; and second, a kind of resentment that their own dignity was being somehow or other questioned; and maybe a third one, a considerable worry about whatever personal liability they might have in court cases, and so on, or what liabilities they had as a board.

So the code was produced, I think with all of these motives, as a device for trying to provide genuine legal bases for handling any kinds of breaches of discipline. And, of course, the code, as it came out—the proposal, the so-called interim code—was one that Procter Hug, [Jr.] wrote, which was not a bad document, certainly. It had some things in it that the faculty objected to strenuously, primarily codes of behavior which could not be specifically defined, and therefore, were subject to abuse by an administrator. Use of obscene language was one that there was much controversy on, and people who would not have any particular affection for obscene language objected, still, to the rule just because of the difficulties of defining obscenity. And so that was a major kind of problem. And then there were others of that sort.

Well, you have not only the interim code, but the code was then submitted to the Faculty Senate for their comments and possible revisions, and about this time, everybody started getting in the act. There were a number of proposed codes, so that the regents and the

committees were almost equally confused as to which code was which. And they got to be identified by the colors of the paper on which they were printed, which was maybe one of the best ways to identify them. These were earlier versions of the Rules for Disciplinary Procedure for Members of the University Community. Regent—or, ex-Regent, by that time, Tom Bell, had produced that version of the interim code, pretty much modeled on the code that was imposed on the California State College System. And this was objected to.

Well, anyway, this interim code, at the start, produced, in some ways, one of the most interesting kinds of developments in faculty-administration relationships, because it did provide a way for a kind of joint action on it, or a joint recommendation on it, which took the form, sometimes, of cooperation, and sometimes of straight controversy and arguing. And, of course, the regents ultimately made the decision on it; the obscenity is still there, although not defined.

And interestingly, in the year the code has been in effect, there has been no occasion to use it, and I suspect there won't be—well, certainly not many, one reason being that one of the things that we did get into the code, from the faculty committees, was that complaints had to be written and signed. This poses a real difficulty on the kind of gossipy complaints that turned up before, because so many of those, particularly the charges of bad behavior levied against teaching assistants, and charges of obscenity, most of these were word of mouth complaints, exaggerated from one transmission to another, and not requiring any sort of responsibility. The Las Vegas people wanted it to be notarized, as well, which I think did not get into the final document, but it was suggested.

In some ways, still, from the point of view of university administration, this did have

real significance in getting the faculty and the faculty representatives and the Board of Regents at least directing their attention to a single document. Also—and this, I think, is important, too, so far as the development of university government and affairs go—students took a more active part in connection with the code of conduct than they had on most matters of broad university policy before. There was a student committee, there were student representatives on the faculty committee, and the students—ultimately, the committees pretty much separated, with a somewhat different procedure for students than for faculty, which makes a certain amount of sense. But for a long time, the two committees did work pretty closely together, and then did work cooperatively all the time. So that the interim code did involve the activities of the code committees.

Ruth G. Hilts: This latest document that's come out, the [systems] code written by the administration, does that pose any frustrations for the [Faculty] Senate committee at all? Have you been negated anywhere along the line in there?

Oh, sure. well, the code committee worked last year on a kind of UNR code, or systems code, and worked, really, somewhat in the dark, not being sure whether we were actually hoping to produce a total code for the system, or whether we were producing only the UNR version, which would later be put together into a systems code. And there was a UNR code with a lot of systems implications adopted by the faculty last spring.

Then, during the summer and in the early fall, it became apparent that there were different codes, proposed from UNR, from the UNLV, from the DRI, and from the community college division, and that

all of these differed in various ways, and that there had to be some kind of systems code provided. There wasn't any systems machinery to provide it, and so Chancellor Humphrey did, I think, pretty much on his own, produce a systems code. That was not distributed widely. I think it may have been given to the Board of Regents for information, but I'm not sure, now, whether he did at that stage or later. But the chancellor did produce this code as a systems code, cutting out, or leaving for division bylaws, a great amount of the material that had earlier been in the code, and then proceeded to work with that, largely through the chancellor's cabinet, which is composed of the four presidents, and the four presidents of the senates, and he added to it chairmen of a couple of code committees, and so on.

So we worked several days as a committee of the cabinet on revisions of the chancellor's draft of the systems code. And then, from the chancellor's cabinet, a drafting committee worked several weeks here. That was a small committee. It was Tom Logan, from UNLV, and Don Fowler from DRI, and the chancellor, and me. He simply went over the wording and argued for several weeks, getting a version of the systems code.

Then the systems code, after these revisions, went to the senates and got some more work done on it. And at the present time, there are three versions of the systems code in existence, all of them now before the Board of Regents for their action. One of them is the buff document, which was what the cabinet finally produced as a result of the subcommittees on drafting, and so on. So it's generally the chancellor's code, except that there are two or three items in which the cabinet disagreed with the chancellor, and these remain as the chancellor wanted them. Then there is the green document, which

is the one that the UNR senate approved, and, I guess, the UNLV senate more or less approved it. And then there is a new one, a white one, which just appeared, which was just produced by the officers. And this has some variations, also. Well, the regents now have all the versions in front of them, and may very well act on them at the next meeting—I don't know. They have the final vote, then, on which one, or which combination, is the final code.

I suppose that there are some legal questions involved—that is, can the regents impose a code without the agreement of the faculties? And I suppose they can, although I doubt that they would. It would be a fairly bad tactic. But they will, obviously, make the final decision, and I suspect there will be compromises among the three codes when they do.

The interesting thing, in a way, from the point of view of university government, is that the work on a systems code did produce some new kinds of problems, and from the point of view, again, of administration and government and division of responsibility. Some of these are highly interesting and had not come up because the systems problem had not come up. Some of those it might be interesting just to remember, the ones that have specific problems that have been developed. One of them, for example, is whether there should be any kind of overall faculty—systemwide—faculty organization, or faculty representation other than on the chancellor's cabinet. At the present time, a sort of jerry-built coordinating council was produced at the time the system went in, as a way of getting information from the senates, and discussing problems that had importance for all divisions of the system. The coordinating council met infrequently, and was likely to end in even divisions on the votes

because of some regional interests, I suppose, partly, and because of equal representation. It did not work very well, and there was some disposition to drop it entirely.

The faculties, however, were worried about the lack of any kind of faculty recommendation or advice on what many faculty members feel are likely to be the biggest problems in state education within the next few years—that is, the problems that involve allocation of responsibilities and educational programs among the divisions. The questions were of all sorts, “If there’s a law school, where’s the law school going to be located?” Now, if this is handled purely on the basis of pressures to the Board of Regents from administrations, the faculty feel that perhaps some considerations of faculty interest won’t get considered. Or questions that certainly are going to have to be solved on responsibilities for things like graduate education between UNLV and UNR—it’s just going to be too expensive to try to produce Ph.D. programs in all subjects at both institutions, and to build libraries that will support those programs. And again, the faculty feel that these are likely to be significant enough that there ought to be some kind of representation. So the faculty Senates at Reno and Las Vegas, and ultimately the coordinating council, did produce machinery for what I think is currently being called a system senate, I guess, Ethel University of Nevada System Senate, which would be a relatively small number of representatives, proportionately representing the faculties of the four divisions of the University, which would meet with the presidents and the chancellor, and which could have a good deal of power to act on their own, at least in a recommendatory way.

The problem with the coordinating council was partly that they had to have authorization from their senates before they

could express any view, and it was just a totally awkward kind of arrangement. But this has become a point of controversy because the chancellor and the officers of the University do not want this system senate, and the faculties generally seem to want [it], so that this is one that obviously will be argued in front of the Board of Regents.

Another point of difference is the one concerning the final decisions on various personnel actions. At the present time, the Board of Regents does pass on practically all personnel matters, frequently, I suppose, simply ratifying whatever recommendations come in from the presidents. And again, well, the decisions in a couple of recent law cases are obviously pertinent on this subject, the Richardson one, particularly, and the Winterberg case earlier; and there are the Mordy and Adaman cases pending. And all of these are pretty directly concerned with that immediate problem. The faculty position and that of the four presidents—at least, when the chancellor’s cabinet met—all of these were in agreement, that personnel decisions should be made by the president, finally, and that they should stop there, and that the board should not be making personnel decisions. I suppose they had in mind partly the kinds of things that occur—well, the Richardson case is a pretty good example—in which a single name gets picked out, and that recommendation is stopped.

Well, it would be different if the board did a thorough review of all of the recommendations, and did make decisions as if it were a final committee, and studied all the recommendations and all the qualifications, and so on; but it’s just impossible for a lay board meeting once a month, or even more frequently, or with committees, even, to do that. It’s not the kind of thing they ought to do, anyway. So that when they do make decisions,

it almost always has the effect of their picking out a single name.

I'm told that at the last regents' meeting, for example, there was a motion to deny a salary increment to one professor, and, again, it had to be only on the grounds that several people had seen newspaper reports of his activity, so that it almost always becomes one or two regents finding something that they happened to have heard about in a secondary way that they find bad about a person. Other than that, they tend to rubber stamp all recommendations, anyway. And so it seems to the faculty that their one function there is a function they shouldn't be exercising, and the courts seem to be agreeing. And therefore, the regents, I think, are likely to be much more susceptible to delegating these personnel decisions to the faculties and the administrators. And one indication is that in the Rules and Disciplinary Procedures for Members of the University Community, the regents did finally, by a very close vote, decide that there would not be appeals on these decisions to the Board of Regents, that, for example, if the Adamian case were not in effect, Adamian would not have been dismissed because the president's decision would have been final. The president might have been fired, but Adamian would not have been, or maybe both of "them would—I don't know [laughing]—depending on how tempers are operating at the time.

So the two codes now exist, with the chancellor's version having everything, I think, except appointments going to the Board of Regents; the officers' document, a compromise between these, in which only tenure appointments and promotions to the rank of associate or full professor go to the Board of Regents. It looks as if there will be a kind of significant change in personnel procedures, no matter which document is

adopted, [and] that probably there will be that kind of change.

And then there are other differences and other points. There has been a good deal of concern about one of the really unsolved, still, problems of the University system organization, and that is the relative responsibilities of [the] chancellor and the president. This has not been changed in any of the codes, largely because changing things would require so complete a sort of overhaul of the entire arrangement that nobody really felt capable of undertaking it, I suppose; also, because duties between the chancellor and the presidents are outlined in the Board of Regents' bylaws; and also, because the presidents and the chancellor both seem to feel that the current system is working pretty well, even though there are some serious questions, I think, in the long run.

The codes, pretty much, then, simply accepted, with some minor revisions, mostly for clarification, what the current regents' bylaws do in specifying the duties and responsibilities of chancellor and president; but there has been a lot of discussion about it, largely because so many of these specifications are so ambiguous. The chancellor—in some instances—is talked about as a kind of staff officer who reports to the Board of Regents (and functions mainly as a kind of staff officer for the Board of Regents). At other times, and for other functions, he seems to be in a kind of line position, in which the presidents report to him and report to the board through him. But at the same time, both the presidents and the chancellor are said to have the right to report directly to the Board of Regents. So you've got, in some ways, a kind of awkward situation there. And probably, with the present personnel and these understandings, it is working, but as "a way of running a railroad," it looks a little strange sometimes.

One other difference between the codes, though, is that the officers' code, the most recent one, the white one, leaves out any description of the duties and responsibilities of chancellor and president entirely, saying that these shall appear in the regents' bylaws. Well, this, you see, has an interesting effect in that it removes from the specified amendment procedures any possible changes in duty of president and chancellor, so I'm sure the faculty will object to that.

Is there a deadline on when this has to be all finished?

Oh, I think I remember that the regents set a deadline two years ago, or something, that if it wasn't finished, something drastic would happen. It was before the intervention of The Rules and Disciplinary Procedures for Members of the University Community, and it was also before some of the complexities of the whole thing developed— mostly so many people getting into the act.

There's one other [subject] that's interesting, and that is that the present code, the one that we're working under (the 1968 is the final revision of it, I think)—the present code specifies that a faculty member on tenure may be removed only for cause, but it does not specify cause. And many feel that that's wise, that you should not specify cause. On the other hand, there've been attempts in all of these codes to specify cause. And all of the versions agree that incompetence to perform the duties for which the faculty member is hired, or failure to perform these duties, are causes for dismissal. The faculty code stops there, with those two causes. But from then on, there is practically no agreement whatsoever.

The other cause, which is one with much longevity— and great dignity—in all such documents is moral turpitude.

What's that?

Well, this is the right question. Moral turpitude is a cause for dismissal, but beyond that, defining it gets to be very, very difficult. There are apparently legal definitions, which involve all kinds of doubletalk and difficulties—"crimes against nature" is a favorite form of moral turpitude, whatever those are.

Is a crime against Governor's Day some kind of moral turpitude? (laughing)

Well, pretty clearly, that's the kind of issue that does come up. One variation on the moral turpitude one is conviction under criminal laws of a crime involving moral turpitude. Well, the people who want moral turpitude in say, "That's not enough. We want to be able to get rid of a turpitudinous person whether he's been convicted or not," [laughing] and that, I agree, anybody who's turpitudinous is in some trouble.

And then, the most recent thing is that ex-Regent, now legal advisor, Tom Bell, has produced a much longer set of causes, and these produced some real questions, so far as faculty interest is concerned— insubordination, for example, or dishonesty. These, it seems to me, are subject to real abuse, and I'm sure that the faculty will object pretty strenuously to broad categories like that as causes for dismissal. Well, dishonesty: Does that mean—is lying about your income tax grounds for dismissal? I don't know. Or is it just practical? And I suspect that some of the board members are just as guilty of mild cheating on income tax as faculty members, and maybe have more basis for it. All of these are—are terribly difficult to define. And I'm sure this will be a kind of major point of contention.

On the whole, what the code problems have produced, I think, are really interesting questions about the relative responsibilities of faculty and administration. This is maybe the basic thing. And curiously, in spite of the shift in a lot of institutions—that is, it's been happening in California, for example, partly as a result of the campus unrest, and so on—a much more strongly dictatorial attitude on the parts of boards of regents and administrators. And I think, interestingly, we've escaped most of that kind of controversy here. There has been, in the writing of the code, a pretty consistent bit of pulling in two directions. A statement in the faculty version of the code will read that something "requires approval of the faculty," and in the officers' code, it will say, "requires consideration by the officers." And these differences run all through. But, still, the new code is likely, I suspect, to come out with, maybe, more protections for faculty than the current ones, partly because the regents are interested in having all of the legal guarantees that the AAUP and others require, and also because the regents want to be on firm legal ground in any personnel decisions, I think.

Maybe that's all I've got to say on the code subject.

I was wondering if it is fear of what the code may or may not provide for faculty that's caused this new organization (National Society for Professors) to form. Do you have any words on that subject?

I don't know, really, much about it. I'm not a member, and I haven't decided whether I'm going to join or not. I think that the new organization has formed largely out of a growing sense of distrust—a growing sense that the regents do not trust the faculty—a growing resentment on difficulties of communication with the regents. Now,

whether that's worse than it used to be or not, I don't know. It is certainly not worse than it was in some years I can remember twenty or thirty years ago.

On the other hand, I think it has worsened in the last few years, and, the evidences there are—well, the forced resignation of the president is one very obvious indication of that in the eyes of the faculty, in which, apparently, two members of the board, by using what seemed to be pretty much unscrupulous tactics with the press, were able just to make things unpleasant enough that the president did resign. And there have been similar kinds of things, comments in regents' meetings about the incompetence of the faculty representatives, and fairly insulting remarks from time to time, which have, I think, bothered some faculty members.

It's interesting that most of the people active in the new organization, have been active in the [Faculty] Senate of the University that last year or two, and, I think, are moved mainly by a sense of frustration in getting things considered seriously by the board. And whether the pressures of collective bargaining will do it or not, I just don't know. In a way, this provides, certainly, a kind of supplement to the code—that is, if we do go to collective bargaining. In salaries and, I suppose, other matters, too, if we do go to that, we are, in a way, changing the general code procedures that have been followed in the past (or at least supplementing them). And it may be—at least, a lot of writers seem to feel—that collective bargaining is inevitable for university faculties in all kinds of ways, that it's the only way which will work out.

University salaries at Nevada have apparently slipped back relatively more than we realize. The salary committees have been producing figures which suggest that the kinds of information we've been operating under are

perhaps not totally adequate, that when we are said to be relatively in a good position as far as western colleges and universities go, that there's been some selection of the western colleges and universities, notably complete omission of Hawaii and Alaska. Well, I can understand why Hawaii and Alaska would throw the graphs way out, because, particularly in Alaska, the living cost is so very high. But living costs are pretty high in Reno, too. And perhaps Pocatello, Idaho, throws it out in the other direction, to some extent. So the current salary committee report suggested we are not in such a good position, as far as relative salaries go. And maybe collective bargaining is the answer. I don't know.

Does it bother you philosophically at all?

Oh, no. I mean, the talk, that it's unprofessional, and so on, I don't know quite what that means. I don't object to being an employee, and I don't object to working for a salary. What does bother me about it are some of the implications of the whole union approach. That is, I don't care whether there's collective bargaining on the salary. And think that high salaries are a good thing. I don't object to them. I do, on the other hand, object to some of the implications that come with that, and that is that you work an eight-hour day, or you punch a time clock, or you get paid for hours of services rendered, and this, it seems to me, would be very much detrimental to the whole notion of a university professor's activities. I much prefer to work eight-hour days when I want to, and work sixteen-hour days when I want to, and work three-hour days when I want to. And—some days, I do all three of them.

Well, it seems to me that, certainly, the character of the University has shifted pretty

dramatically since I have been here, and that in some ways, it's only in the last, oh, ten or fifteen years that Nevada has actually become a university in any real sense—that is, the shift (toward) a university which does consider itself at least attempting to do the kinds of things that other universities are doing, the shift from being a pretty provincial undergraduate school, training people largely with a notion of their being successful at Nevada. This has been partly a matter of growth in size. I think I remember that in the boom after the war, when I came here, there were eight or nine hundred students, so that in a way, the increase here is almost as dramatic, on a percentage basis, as it is in some of the very large institutions. But it's more than that. It's a shift, also, in which, instead of one's being criticized for scholarly activities, as was true when I came here [E. W.] Ed Lowrance in biology was ridiculed, really, very, very severely because he published some papers on the bone structure of the muskrat, and this made the legislature [say], "yeah, yeah, yeah. What're they doin' up at that place?" Those were the days in which someone of the legislature seriously questioned the book budget for the library, "Have them fellers read all the ones they got up there now?" That kind of thing was going on pretty seriously at the time. So, overall, it seems to me there's no doubt that the University has grown up in many ways.

On the other hand, I suppose I also have a feeling that, in some ways, with the size, have come some real losses in education. I think standards are certainly less rigid than they were, in many ways. I'm pretty sure that students get out of my classes with higher grades knowing less than they did ten or fifteen years ago, and I think this is true pretty generally. There are more weak students, and perhaps we are less stringent

in our requirements of students. Now, I'm not suggesting that's necessarily bad, but it is a change. And the attention to the poorly prepared student and trying to help him through is, I think, an admirable thing. But it does provide some differences. We've lost some of the relatively close personal instruction that we had a few years ago. We still are infinitely better off than a lot of places. I have a feeling that we do [provide] as good education as a lot of places with better reputations, so far as individual classes are concerned—not all classes and not all people, but that's true everywhere. We have—the staff has continued, I think, to improve generally. There was always, from the time I came here, I think, a rather surprisingly large nucleus of good staff, both good teachers and accomplished scholars. That's somewhat better now, I think, and on the whole, it seems to me that we do good undergraduate instruction. The classes are still relatively small. There are some whoppers, and there are kids who manage to get lost around the place and wander around and never learn where they are, but I suspect fewer than in some of the other large institutions these days.

And so I'm reasonably optimistic about broad matters of that sort. We're certainly less provincial than we were. The state retains some provincial attitudes (the attitude on out-of-state travel, for example), but I'm not sure that that's as much provincial as it is just economical. "We just don't want to send these people out on junkets to glamorous places like Boston, or Chicago, or—."

The curious thing is, to me, I see at the present time really no connection whatsoever between intercollegiate athletics as they operate and educational institutions. This is one of the extraordinary anachronisms of our whole society, that we have these elaborate athletic programs connected with universities. You have to move them as far as you can toward

professionalism so that they are successful, or your alumni are unhappy; and if you keep them amateur so that the kids can play, then nobody's interested in it, and you can't hire successful coaches, and you've got another kind of disaster. So that philosophically, and in every way, even though I'm quite fond of athletics and interested in them, it seems to me that there's no argument whatsoever for keeping them at all on an intercollegiate basis. I would say just chuck the whole lot and have intramural sports, and I'm quite serious about that. It seems to me that's the only—the only sensible way out for American athletics.

Now all the arguments that they are useful because they provide training for professional athletes—well, there are better ways to train professional athletes. Baseball—baseball got along with their farm teams much better than Nevada did. We had a farm team for the Cleveland Browns here when I first came here, and they would ship out various athletes who had been relatively successful in high school in Ohio, or someplace, and they would come to Nevada and play. In those days, we had a withdrawal rule, which was very convenient, because they could go right up to the end of the football season and then withdraw without penalty. And so they would come out and play the football season, usually didn't attend class at all, and then, after one semester, they could go back [after their] seasoning, and they would "come from Nevada." And Horace Gillum, I remember, was [one of these].

Oh, this was when we had big football?

And— well, even before. I think Jim Aiken started the farm system, with Paul Brown and the Cleveland Browns. And Horace Gillum appeared, I think, the first or second year I was here. He was the best punter that the National Football League ever had. He was

a tremendous kicker, and a fine, big boy. But I remember my wife was teaching that semester, and he came into class, and said, "I just want you to know, Mrs. Gorrell, I haven't got anything against you. I just don't like classes much, so you won't see me again," and that was the end of Horace. He was a very nice, polite young man, and very honest. He wasn't going to mess around with classes—it got in the way of his football and his social life. (There were a lot of those kids.)

But it seems to me that if you're going to go professional, you might as well do it honestly. It would be better, maybe—even maybe hire a team to—if you wanted to get university publicity out of it, something of that sort. But getting it all mixed up with education seems to me a very, very strange business.

As far as the Nevada program goes, I don't know much about it. I don't find myself irate when the basketball team loses. I'm not terribly concerned that we have winning teams. I think the shift to a league which had bigger competition as a way of improving our athletic program carried with it a kind of a logic that I never could understand. I think it's interesting that the faculty were never consulted, so far as I know, on that shift. We were really getting along pretty well in a kind of amateur Far Western League. And to argue that since we're getting along there fairly well but don't have as good teams as we ought to have, we should therefore get into a [league] with tougher competition, just—I don't follow. But anyway, we did—and—so we got beat. I guess that it's probably psychologically unpleasant to an athlete to be beaten all the time, [so] why don't they play somebody they can beat once in a while? [laughing]

So—no, I'm not an authority on athletics. I like athletics, but I see no reason for not just chucking the whole lot these days.

COMMISSION ON STATUS OF WOMEN

DEAN ROBERTA BARNES, CHAIRMAN

Roberta Barnes: I'm Roberta Barnes, Dean of Students at the University, and one of my assignments for this year has been to serve as chairman of the University's Commission on the Status of Women. Last summer, the president received a resolution from the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors recommending that every college and university establish a commission on women. He sent this recommendation to me and asked what I thought of it, and I said, "By all means, we should do it." Then he requested nominations from the ASUN president, the chairman of the Faculty Senate, some recommendations from me about administrators, and from the Clerical Council for nonacademic personnel.

The commission was appointed in November, and it has representatives from all segments of the University on it, plus one member of the Alumni Association, plus one faculty wife who is also a professor but not teaching. We have three men, thirteen women:

Chairman:

Roberta Barnes, Dean of Students

Members:

Lori Backman, Undergraduate Student (Junior)

Chris Batjer, undergraduate Student (Senior)

Mildred Brown, Professor on Leave
Grace M. Donehower, Assistant Dean,
General University Extension

Charlotte B. Gale, Professor of Nursing
Eugene K. Grotegut, Professor of
Foreign Languages and Literatures

Lynne M. Hall, Undergraduate Student (Senior)

Brian Lahren, Graduate Teaching Fellow, Psychology

Mena M. Porta, Administrative Secretary to Vice President of Academic Affairs

Ada F. Richmond, Information Systems Researcher, College of Education

Ellen M. Robinson, Senior Library Assistant, Noble Getchell Library

Darlene S. Russell, graduate Teaching
Fellow, English

Myra R. Stratton, Graduate Student

Barbara C. Thornton, Alumni
Association

Robert G. Whittemore, Dean, General
University Extension

(Appointed by President N. Edd Miller)

The commission came up with a list of things it should study for the year, about twenty-five items long. We narrowed it down to five that we would really focus in on. The most important one is a study of professional women. We're using Miss Porta in the Academic Personnel office, and she has gathered the data on all the men and women who have professional status—salary, rank, length of time in rank, highest earned degree—and that's going to be fed into the computer so that, hopefully, we will be able to compare the treatment men have received as opposed to women with equal qualifications.

So that's one subcommittee. The second one was to look in [to] the possibility of establishing a child care center. The president of AWS and two of the graduate students on the committee worked on this and were successful in setting up a half-day child care center in the home economics building, and convinced the ASUN that they should fund the project. So it is moving right along. We need a much larger facility, which we're working on.

Third subcommittee was concerned with disseminating information. They have set up a file in the education building at this point with information on the women's movement in general.

Fourth subcommittee was concerned with sponsoring an open hearing.. We had the hearing, and women from all over the campus came to testify. We filled up all four hours with

hearing about the kinds of problems they had had.

And the last subcommittee was a committee to survey attitudes toward women on the campus. They have the questionnaire ready to go, and it bogged down at the point of selecting a random sample of students, faculty, and so forth. still hoping to get that survey completed this spring.

In the meantime, we found out that the federal government is requiring that each college and university with federal contracts have an Affirmative Action statement on women, as well as minorities, so for the past two weeks, we have been hard at work developing an Affirmative Action statement that—and there's a section for students, nonacademic personnel, academic personnel, university governance and administration, and a machinery for hearing grievances. This document has gone to the Academic Council, and didn't receive too much criticism there, which really surprised me. And next, it's going to the Faculty Senate and to the Student Senate. We hope all three groups will adopt it before the school year's out. That's expecting a lot, since it's now the middle of April, and [laughing] they don't have too much time to deliberate.

The things that were included in our Affirmative Action statement were a result of the criticism we had heard from members of the commission about what happens to women at the University, and the complaints that were voiced at the hearing. So it's aimed at specific problems, and in each case, we've stated an objective and what kind of action is required to achieve that objective. So it's going to mean a lot of work for a lot of people, to look into whether women have or have not received equal treatment in each department, and if not, take immediate steps to rectify this problem, and so forth. So it's a very interesting

document, and, hopefully, it will be adopted before the year's up.

Another interesting committee I have been serving on this year is for the National Student Exchange Program, which is a first for Nevada. It was about two months ago that the regents approved the program and gave us permission to exchange six students with other universities inside the country. And the students who come to us will pay resident fees here, and our students will pay resident fees at the institutions they go to. So we're sending our students to the University of Oregon, Hawaii, Montana, Illinois State, and South Florida, and they will either be sophomores or juniors next year. So, hopefully, they will come back and share their experiences on other campuses with the students who have stayed here, and help us develop some new programs and move ahead.

To go back to the problems of women for a moment, the athletic program is one of the big concerns, and was discussed by the commission. The students are concerned about two things: one is that the ASUN has lost control over the seven dollars and fifty cents, which they pay, and which they formerly could decide about what it should be used for. And the women are concerned because seven dollars goes to the men's athletic program, and fifty cents goes to support the women's program.

The Women's Recreation Association has been the main group for women, as far as providing them with an opportunity to participate in sports. And actually, it's just an intramural program, not intercollegiate athletics. But there are several athletic programs for women, for which there is a lot of interest at this point—the women's ski team, the women's gymnastic team, particularly—and those weren't funded sufficiently so that our outstanding women could participate.

So the action the commission took was to recommend that the Faculty Senate study the athletic program, and that at least one woman be appointed to the group that was studying the situation.

Also, in the Affirmative Action Program, the commission asked that the ASUN, the athletic department, and the PE department evaluate the programs for men and women and the facilities made available to each, and that any inequities be taken care of within a two-year period. So we're very hopeful that we'll stir up a little action on that problem.

The issue on ROTC was a disappointment to students because we have some students who have been working for the whole four years of their college education, trying to succeed in making ROTC voluntary, and this was the last opportunity these students will have. And when it was defeated by the regents, they were demoralized over it.

I think one of the solutions to the problem is to make ROTC coeducational. The Air Force has done this, the Navy has done it, and this year, the Army is doing it on a trial basis on ten campuses. And we received a letter asking us if we would be interested, but we were not one of the ten schools selected, and I was very sorry we weren't. I think if it were a coeducational program, we would have plenty of officers commissioned each year so that we wouldn't have to worry about not meeting our quotas. And it's an opportunity that should be open to women, because the careers in the Army for women are fantastic right now, and they do have an opportunity to be promoted clear up to the General level. And with all of the equal rights discussions that are going on, it's unfortunate that women don't have this opportunity on this campus. So I have the solution to that problem!

On the out-of-state tuition question, it was very interesting this year, because we had

so many students who decided to qualify for resident status by staying out of school for six months. Somehow, the rumor went far and wide on the campus, so the Admissions office was buried in applications for resident status. And people felt like they had been led astray when their applications were turned down. They felt it was automatic, [that] after six months, they would be considered residents. And because so many of them took issue with the decision that was made, and registered their cars in Nevada, and registered to vote in Nevada, and did all of the things to really look like residents, we asked our representative of the Attorney General's office to review the criteria for resident status, to give us some more definite guidelines so that the students would know exactly what they had to do to become residents. We think this is going to be helpful, but we're also concerned about what will happen when the first case goes through court, and whether any of this will hold up, now that eighteen-year-olds have been approved to vote where they're going to school, and if it doesn't hold up, what it will mean for Nevada residents in terms of the fee raise they will have to have in order to balance the budget.

As far as where the University is going, I have some feelings about it, but there are a lot of people who would disagree with me, I'm sure. I think we've made some steps in the last few years toward making the University available to a large segment of the population that it was not available to before, mainly minority and low income students who felt they had no chance to succeed, no opportunity, really, to even be admitted to the University, let alone graduate. This has been done through federally-sponsored programs for the most part—Upward Bound and Talent Search—which find students in high schools, encourage them to raise their grades

to qualify for admission, offer remedial programs to those who need it, and help them adjust to the University through summer programs, and so forth and our Special Services Program, which offers counseling and tutoring services to the students after they arrive on campus. We know we need to do a great deal more, because many of the minority students are discouraged while they're still in high school and drop out, so that they don't really have an opportunity to get here.

Also, I think we've been more receptive to the older student returning to school. We have well over a thousand (I can't remember the exact number) students who are over twenty-five attending the University at this point, and they range in age to seventy-one. So I think we are moving toward a concern about providing education for all kinds of people at all stages in their lives, and, to some extent, regardless of their background.

Another indication of this is a committee that was established to study the feasibility of a college of general studies. This would be the "college without walls" kind of thing. People in Winnemucca and Elko and Pioche could be taking courses and working toward a degree without coming to the campus, except maybe a few times for seminars, and so forth, using cassettes to send them lessons and having visiting professors go to the community and hold seminars in an area where there were several people taking a course, this kind of thing.

It would be almost a separate college in that people would receive a degree from the college of general studies, or they could take their first few years there and transfer to engineering, or whatever they were interested in; probably no admission requirements, and a very flexible policy so that people could be admitted without a big hassle.

And that is moving along, but slowly. At this point, the committee's made recommendations to the president and drawn up case histories of the kinds of students who need and would benefit from this kind of program. And I'm sure it will have to wait for funding, as everything else has to [laughing]. But it's encouraging to know that people are concerned about expanding educational opportunities for people in the state, and are really working at it.

I don't think a lot of people who aren't on the committee know about it. It's interesting that two forces have been working in opposition to each other. While the Special Services people have been interested in establishing a qualifying program for a limited number of students to come to the University without meeting the usual admission requirements, and this committee's been working (on) the college of general studies, a recommendation has come up from the Admissions office, through the various governing bodies, recommending that admission standards be raised.

Well, there are many people in the University who have different philosophies about what a university is. And I think the old elitist kind of—well, the elitist university, I guess, was the first, when wealth determined who went to school, and then merit. Those who did well academically were those who were acceptable. And some people here are still in that phase of the university, where only the brightest people, who actually need to be educated least, are welcome. And then there is another group that's into what I think is the new era, of making education more available to those who need it most, and wherever. They are moving them ahead and preparing them for an occupation, for life in general. And it's difficult, because I'm sure a lot of friendships have been strained over the issue.

FACULTY SENATE

PROFESSOR HUGH N. MOZINGO, CHAIRMAN

Hugh N. Mozingo: I'm Hugh Mozingo, chairman of the biology department, and also chairman this year, '71 and '72, of the University of Nevada, Reno, Faculty Senate. I am not certain that this has been a year with more turmoil than the past, but certainly, we've had our full share this year. And some of the issues that come to mind would be, early in the fall, the occupation of offices at the student union by the Black Student Union group. This, in my opinion, led, a few weeks later, to the proffered resignation of President Miller. Although, ostensibly, there was no connection between the two events, I think most of us on the faculty regard the two events as closely correlated. Certainly, the occupation also led to a call for an investigation of the whole athletic program. Although the initial focus seems to have been on the Black athlete, eventually, a larger charge was given to the athletic investigation committee, formed several months later by the senate. This committee is presently continuing its investigations rather intensively, [and] probably will do so under

the chairmanship of John Marschall well into next year. I have no way of anticipating any results that they'd come up with now, though.

The most traumatic event during the fall was certainly President Miller's anticipated resignation. There were all sorts of rumors flying back and forth about who was going to be his successor, and some of them were rather far-fetched. Some of us were concerned as much about President Miller's possible successor as losing a very good man in President Miller. So the end result was that the senate was enough concerned over this that we held a special meeting of all the faculty and had a number of people speak to the worth of President Miller to this campus, and the good things that he's done. And there was a unanimous vote on the faculty's part to recommend to the Board of Regents that his resignation not be accepted.

Subsequent to that, I attended the special personnel session of the Board of Regents, and presented the faculty's viewpoint regarding President Miller, along with Dan Klaich and several students who presented the students'

viewpoint. And the eventual result, as I recall the Vote, was that only two of the regents voted to accept his resignation. The others rejected it. So that was at least one— I'm not sure you'd call [it a] "battle," but anyway, one skirmish that the Faculty Senate engaged in that we felt that we did have a significant impact on the Board of Regents, and perhaps caused them to reconsider their original viewpoint about President Miller.

About the same time, we were working very hard towards a resolution of the salary picture for next year. And we had been told by Chancellor Humphrey last spring (when I was vice-chairman of the senate) that the reason the salary schedule, the rank picture, had not been changed for this year was because the senate had dropped the ball, had not made recommendations in sufficient time. I was determined that that would not happen again, and so the first committee that was organized at the end of August—the earliest we can get these things organized— was the salary committee, under the chairmanship of Jim [James S.] Roberts. I picked him because he has experience as a former deputy budget director for the state. I attended the first meeting of that committee, and I impressed on Jim, in as firm a fashion as I could, that we, the senate, insisted on a recommendation with regard to salaries at its October meeting. We were anxious that these recommendations be given to the chancellor's office in time to influence next year's salary consideration, and I was determined that we weren't going to have the excuse given that we had not gotten the picture in in time to the chancellor's office.

Well, the end result is that we did come up with salary recommendations in October (October twenty-eighth). The senate passed a resolution to raise the base by approximately three percent, and to increase the increment in each step for each of the four ranks.

I might mention that a member of this committee was Don [Donald K.] Jessup, and he was appointed as a consultant to the committee because we felt that this would give us some insight into the chancellor's thinking on the whole salary picture. He did give us a wealth of statistics, and we made use of these, and we had incorrectly assumed that our salary recommendations had the tacit approval of the chancellor's office since we had heard no objections.

In any event, along with the faculty minutes, and officially, through the president's office, our recommendations were transmitted during November, early November, to the chancellor's office. We heard nothing more concerning them until a cabinet meeting at the end of December. And at that time, I was informed by the chancellor that he would not accept our recommendations because we had not adequately justified them. I think this was the twenty-ninth of December, as I recall.

UNLV at the same time requested that the January meeting of the Board of Regents not consider the salary picture because they had not adequately worked up their salary recommendations. They were putting some of the information on a computer. They were going to look at national averages, and they wanted to get that data in before they submitted their recommendations.

And the chancellor, then, agreed to deferring the salary recommendations until February. But he said that he did want the materials in his office by January twelfth.

I immediately went down to Jim Roberts and informed him that we had not adequately justified our recommendations, that the chancellor's office required additional recommendations. So he got his committee together and drew up additional recommendations and got them down to the chancellor's office, as I recall, January the eleventh.

The next we heard was during the cabinet meeting at the end of January. This was the first day of school. I don't recall the date, but at any rate, the first day of school for the second semester. I could not attend the cabinet meeting because I had three classes that day, and Jim Roberts had three classes. And—oh, I'm sorry. This was a coordinating council meeting, and not a cabinet meeting. It had been called the previous week, and none of us could attend because of classes on the first day of school. We regretted somewhat that it could not have been arranged either prior or later, some more convenient date, although I can appreciate the deadlines involved, and perhaps it wasn't possible.

In any event, Bob [Robert N.] Tompson, of the mathematics department, substituted for Jim Roberts during the major portion of that meeting. And at the meeting was presented another document by Don Jessup, which, statistically, at least, attempted to demolish the statistical basis of our own document. We had never seen [it]—it was a large document. We had not seen it before, and despite the fact that Bob Tompson is a mathematician of some expertise, it was very difficult for him to look over a large document in that meeting while being being told about the document and with other people talking. He was supposed to read the document and comment on its validity at the same time. The end result was that—. Of course, it wasn't possible during that meeting to effectively counter the document.

Well, at the February meeting of the Board of Regents, our recommendations went forward, essentially as they were, with the justifications we had developed, to the Board of Regents. UNLV came in with another set of recommendations, and the chancellor's office came in with still a third recommendation. The result was that the University faculty presented a rather

disorganized front. The coordinating council had not coordinated the salary picture, and the Board of Regents adopted, then, the chancellor's recommendations. There was a rather lengthy debate at the Board of Regents meeting, itself, over the salary picture. And the end result was, of course, that we did not have our recommendations adopted.

There was considerable chagrin subsequent to that board meeting on the part of the senate, and a feeling on the part of many of the committee members—the salary committee members and other senators—that perhaps not all of the negotiations had been bilateral. We felt that we could have been informed earlier about Don Jessup's viewpoints. I was told, when I asked at the end of December, why—in addition to the lack of justification, I asked why this raise was not a good thing, and Chancellor Humphrey was very emphatic about the need to stick to fourth place. He resisted the idea of “fourth place or better” at that time. And he also was emphatic that he thought that politically, it was wiser to stick with the old salary picture that we had used last year and this year.

Ruth G. Hilts: What did he mean by fourth place?

Fourth place among western universities, excluding Alaska and Hawaii. There's been some difficulty in developing a fourth place figure, and the fourth place concept, the way in which the chancellor's office calculates it, is not quite the way we calculate it, so we don't quite agree on whether or not we're at fourth place. But the point is, whether we are or not, that we felt that fourth place was a poor goal. Perhaps it sufficed well when we were down at eighth or ninth, but—you know—why now fourth place? We're up at fourth place, according to the chancellor, and so we ought

not to go any higher, and we don't agree with that.

Incidentally, the UNLV salary picture developed the information that we were about nine percent (in terms of total compensation) behind the national average. And we feel this is a more valid picture in attempting to develop the salary recommendations for the biennium budget. We are discussing it with the chancellor's office, although he hasn't agreed. But we are discussing with the chancellor's office the probability that the senate will recommend going to a national average goal, rather than a fourth place goal. And we get the impression, at least, that he's not completely opposed to this idea, although there's nothing in writing to say that he's agreed so far.

I hesitate to say that the negotiations were meaningless, but in talking with the other senate members, and even with a few deans, some of them say in no uncertain terms that they're quite certain that our position was largely ignored on the part of the chancellor's office, and that communication could've been much better. In talking with last year's senate chairman, and with two other previous senate chairmen, we came up with the same opinion, that all of us had been befuddled in our attempts to develop a salary picture because of the same poor communication, lack of communication on the part of the chancellor's office. I think if you're looking for reasons that some of the faculty have felt they have to organize and negotiate independently of the senate with the chancellor's office, then, that's certainly one of the major reasons.

A statement appeared in the newspaper in the fall, to the extent that we, I think, over the past three years, have gone up something like 29.7 percent in salary increases. Well, there's an odd way in which you can figure this, but very few people have [found] anything like

that amount. Some of the very conservative members of the faculty were quite incensed over this figure. And this is the sort of thing that sticks in the mind of most of the faculty members, regardless of how justifiable it is. They felt that they were presented to the community—because it appeared in the newspaper—as having exorbitant increases. And we never really got a satisfactory answer as to why this kind of a figure had to be published in a newspaper. So I think this is the sort of thing that alienates many of the faculty from the administration and helps to recruit members for the National Society for Professors.

Well, that was one of the major items. The code has been another major item that many of us involved with it have reached the limit of our endurance.

How many documents have been presented so far for the code?

Well, starting out, last year's senate sent to the faculty in June a UNR Code—the UNR Code developed by our senate, by the senate's code committee. [It] also contained recommendations with regard to the code for the system, as well as regulations for the UNR campus. This was overwhelmingly approved by the faculty, although some faculty members criticized the fact that it was sent out for a vote in June, when many of the faculty were gone. There was some feeling that—some misunderstanding on the part of some faculty that this was the final document. And as later events showed, it was nowhere near the final document.

During the summer, we had joint code committee-academic council meetings—that is, a subcommittee of the academic council worked with us in developing another document during the summer.

And this document contained a number of recommendations. It was distributed to the senate, but was not sent to the faculty for a vote because near the end of the summer, the advisory cabinet then became involved in developing a code with the chancellor's office. As I recall, I think the first meeting of that took place early in September. We had a number of subsequent meetings, both in Reno and on the UNLV campus, and a consensus document—more or less consensus document—developed out of the advisory cabinet.

There were several important points on which we could not agree, however. The advisory cabinet was unanimously in favor of stopping personnel action on individual campuses. This was not recommended by the chancellor, and he indicated that in alternate versions, versions of that particular section, eventually distributed. The advisory code is now known as the “buff” code. And that has been distributed to the faculty and was voted on.

We also felt strongly that the responsibility of the chancellor's office should be rather accurately defined. There was some difference in point of view about the nature of the chancellor's office. I think the faculty view was primarily that the chancellor was a coordinator. And the chancellor regarded himself as the chief administrator. And so we had some difficulty in reconciling that point of view, of the function of the chancellor versus that of the faculty's point of view.

The academic freedom discussion we really didn't have very much difficulty about. The chancellor has pretty well accepted the AAUP document defining academic freedom, so we had a fairly good general agreement on that.

On the reasons for firing people on probation and those on tenure, however,

we had some difficulty. We did agree that incompetence should be a cause for firing both tenured and nontenured people. There was not agreement, however, that nontenured people, or probationary people, should be fired without a statement of cause. The faculty feeling was that a cause should be given to the person. And the chancellor's office opinion was essentially that cause would not be given except on alleged abridgment of constitutional rights. So we didn't entirely agree. Their cause for firing nontenured people included such things as moral turpitude, which we could not come to agreement on. The faculty opinion was that this was a rather meaningless thing to put into it, since it's so widely interpreted by various people. The chancellor's office felt, and the division presidents felt, that this was an essential thing that needed to be included, but no one really—. Everyone knows what they mean, but no one wants to define it precisely, in print at least, although we did discuss its meaning. And it was apparent that we didn't mean such things as cheating on your income tax, which is technically also moral turpitude. But apparently, there is some reluctance to put in print precisely what is meant. We felt that if moral turpitude was going to be in there, the crime of moral turpitude would make more sense, or a conviction of the crime of moral turpitude. I understand that if you're convicted on an IRS tax evasion charge that that's also considered a crime of moral turpitude. So this came up at the last Board of Regents meeting, and it was apparent that the board members didn't really have that in mind. So I think if they leave it the way it is now, in the faculty's opinion, at least, it's a very poor justification, unless it's more adequately defined.

There is a strong opinion on the part of some faculty that, as long as it doesn't interfere with his teaching responsibilities,

that the individual faculty member has the right to do whatever he wants to on his own time, provided, of course, that such things as mutual consent, and so on, are involved, and that it's really none of the Board of Regents' business. Not all of the faculty, certainly, agreed in that respect, though, but many do feel that moral turpitude ought to be more adequately defined if we're going to use the concept.

Something came up at the last Board of Regents, that what's meant is seduction. And Paul Aizely of the UNLV senate said that while one seduction certainly doesn't count, we must mean repeated seduction, so—[laughing]. And to some people, it means homosexual behavior, and heterosexual doesn't count, so we have a great deal of difficulty deciding on what it means. But at any rate, I'm sure that it'll be a bone of contention in future years if it's included in the code.

The coordinating council attempted to resolve the differences in opinion between the various campuses and division[s] in a document developed, I guess, during January and February, and it was sent out to the faculty for a vote during March. It attempted to resolve the differences, and it came out with a code that had been known as the green code. This is the coordinating council document, and it contained several notable features. One is a recommendation that we not have a coordinating council, as such, but instead, a body known as the higher education council, which would in effect be a super senate, and its decisions would be binding. The UNR campus senate changed the definition somewhat, but the change was not substantial. It changed the apportionment of members, but finally, after some debate, did agree to the binding nature of the decisions of the higher education council, or, as we have called it, the University of Nevada System Senate.

The concept and description of the UNSS, the University of Nevada System Senate, was sent out along with the green code for vote. And the vote, as I recall, was a ten to one vote, in favor of the green code as opposed to the buff code, developed by the advisory cabn.. net and the chancellor's office. There's a strong feeling that despite the fact that it's called the advisory cabinet code, that it's pretty much the chancellor's code (although I'm quite sure the chancellor would not agree to that statement).

The senate learned on the Wednesday prior to the last cabinet meeting, at the end of March, that another code had been prepared. I was called into President Miller's office and informed that the division presidents and the chancellor had prepared what is now called the white, or the officers' code. (It's printed on white paper.) The explanation given by the officers is that they felt that there was some need for them to get their opinions on paper with regard to code. We felt that they had already had sufficient opportunity in the coordinating council and cabinet meetings to express their opinions. But in any event, the white code represents the opinions of the officers.

I first saw the white code at the cabinet meeting at the end of March. Immediately, on receiving it, I took it to the senate office and had the secretary reproduce it and distribute it to the senate members. It was discussed at the past senate meeting. Unfortunately, that was the one senate meeting that I had to be absent from this year. The feeling was, however, that we had already made our recommendations on the code, and we had overwhelmingly expressed a choice for the version [called] the green code, the coordinating council version, and there was no need to go back and to go over the officers' code page by page.

There is some feeling that there are some good points in the officers' code. One is the

recommendation that individual contracts would not go before the Board of Regents unless they involve promotion to associate or full professor, or tenure matters. Simple step increases or merit increases or promotions below that level would not go to the board. And if this recommendation were followed by the Board of Regents, it might avoid some of the problems that we've had in the past. So that, at least, is one good feature. It represents a compromise between the faculty's desire to handle all personnel matters on individual campuses without taking them before the board, and the desire of the board, obviously, to consider all personnel matters. So we hope that, at least, that aspect of it will be approved.

All the documents are now before the board, and I'm hopeful that there will be no new codes added to the pile. And hopefully, sometime in May or in June, the Board of Regents will approve a code that will serve as our guideline, at least temporarily. The UNLV senate chairman has expressed the opinion that we ought to regard whatever code is approved as an interim code, subject to amendment next year. So it's not entirely certain, at least, from their point of view—and I suspect, also, from our point of view—that even when the code is approved, that we've got a final document. Maybe it ought to be regarded as a dynamic document subject to changes—make it “the Board of Regents' changes”—and as the Faculty Senate opinions change. In any event, I'm sure that it's going to be a subject of some continued controversy.

Because of these developments on the code, because of events last year with regard to the failure of Jim [James T.] Richardson's promotion before the board—that is, James Richardson was strongly recommended by the department chairman, the dean, and the president, for a promotion and salary increase.

The Board of Regents turned this down, and the very frank opinion of the faculty with regard to the reason for turning it down was that it was because of his chairmanship of the Adamian defense committee and his occasionally critical comments about the board.

The senate did, on one occasion, request a meeting with one or more members of the board in the chancellor's office, or in the president's office, and originally, Chairman Jacobsen had agreed. However, at the last moment, he decided not to come to the meeting. We met anyway and discussed the situation with Jim Richardson, but never had the benefit of a meeting with the chairman or any representative of the board.

After several appeals by the senate, Chairman [Edmund R.] Barmettler was invited to the executive session, but was not allowed to reveal the comments of the board members with regard to not granting a promotion to Jim Richardson. And no reasons were ever officially given to Richardson or to Ed Barmettler, although Barmettler was told, unofficially by at least one member of the board that if “those professors at the University would learn to keep their noses clean,” or something to that effect, that, “they wouldn't have any trouble” along these lines. Of course, this was not official, but there's little doubt on the part, I think, of all of us familiar with the situation about the reasons for the denial of promotion.

The National Society for professors, which is a subdivision of NEA, the National Education Association (and NSP will be also a subdivision of the Nevada State Education Association, NSEA; NEA is administered through the individual state chapters, such as NSEA), I think had its stimulus in the events of last year, and this year in the disillusionment of many faculty members

with the effectiveness of the Faculty Senate. It's true that many of our recommendations are accepted. In a recent conversation with Chairman Jacobsen, he said he was perplexed about the reason for the faculty feeling that they needed to organize, that we had gotten most of the things we wanted. And I pointed out that I didn't think it was a matter of numbers. I did recently tally the numbers, and roughly about half the things we've asked for, we were granted. But the pattern has been that if the item is a neutral item, or if it's an item that is strongly favored by the community as well as the faculty, there is no question about it being approved by the board. But in those instances where it is not neutral, such as the ROTC program, where there is strong community opposition despite overwhelming advocacy of that position by the Faculty Senate, the board turned the proposition down, we feel, primarily because of this community feeling.

The ROTC—compulsory aspect of the program—although minimal now, is still a symbolic thing that, to many of the faculty, represents the tendency of the board to override the will of the faculty and the students—[the] overwhelming will of the students—when, politically, it seems to be desirable to do so. So I'm sure this counted with some of the faculty in terms of their decision to join the NSP.

The salary picture certainly was another major reason. We have a surprisingly good cross section of faculty represented on NSP, and some quite conservative people joined primarily because of their feeling about the inability of the faculty to negotiate effectively with the chancellor's office in developing a salary schedule.

So our best recruiter has really been the chancellor's office along with the Board of Regents. We have not been really very

active in attempting to recruit. We haven't tried very hard, and we already are above, as of this date, April eighteenth, above sixty members. We began in February, and were officially accepted as a chapter at the end of February by the state NSEA board of directors. And at that time, as I recall, we had just slightly over fifteen. So we've grown remarkably in the past month and a half. UNLV began in November, and had been running along at about twenty members for the past several months, so they've shown relatively slow growth. I think we'll continue to grow, and we'll make a more active campaign to get more members because I strongly feel that the faculty is simply a tool, in many instances, of the administration and, at least, the chancellor's office, and that there has been no very serious attempt to communicate effectively on the more critical matters with the Faculty Senate. I think it's unfortunate that this is not the case. I think the code that's finally accepted by the board may well determine the strength of NSP on this campus. If it's overwhelmingly the point of view favored by the board and by the chancellor's office with little regard for faculty opinion, then I think we don't have to campaign very strongly for more members. I think we'll get them without asking for them.

Let me ask you if this new organization, NSP, will work along with AAUP? Or does it fulfill a completely different function?

Well, certainly, our goals are not in opposition to AAUP, and I don't think it fulfills a very different function. The new president of AAUP has now run on a platform of favoring binding negotiations, arbitration, third party arbitration.

I didn't know that AAUP could arbitrate.

Well, it didn't formerly, but the new president ran on that platform, which chagrined some of the older members. In fact, there are now negotiations on the national level to merge AAUP and NEA, and if this takes place, then, of course, we will have approximately half of the faculty on this campus organized. So, of course, it's too early to say whether this will occur. But if it does occur—and the fact that they're thinking about it, and negotiating, indicates that their goals are not very different—it obviously makes sense not to have four or five different organizations, all directed towards the same goals attempting to represent the faculty. So what we have to work towards, we feel, in NSP, is eventually towards a fifty-one percent membership so that we can speak for the rest of the faculty.

Some other things that we considered this year—the proposal to do away with out-of-state tuition was a rather contentious one, primarily because I first learned about it as a consequence of a telephone call by one of the reporters for the Sagebrush. I knew nothing about it up until that time, and was informed by this reporter that Dan Klaich had been shown a copy of it in his capacity as a personal friend of the president, but not as ASUN president. This made me somewhat irritated, to put it mildly, and [laughing] I attempted to find out more about this, and I did, and succeeded in getting a copy of the proposal, which was a semi legal document attempting to define what a resident was, what a nonresident was, what home is, and what matriculation involves, and so on. In some ways, perhaps, it's a good proposal because I understand that formerly one could matriculate, and once matriculated as an out-of-state student, you could stay here ten years and still be considered out-of-state.

Now, at least, it limits it to a year. If one doesn't matriculate, however, the proposal allows one to achieve residency in six months' time and qualify as an in-state student and avoid the out-of-state tuition.

I carried this to the senate subsequent to official receipt of the document from President Miller, in which he stated there was no attempt at secrecy. The document was transmitted to both Dan Klaich and myself, but I'm unaware that the ASUN senate did anything with it. In any event, the UNR [Faculty] Senate did consider it, and did make the recommendation that the residency should be achieved within a six-month period, regardless of whether the student had matriculated or not, that it could be achieved within six months by the same criteria that one achieves residency for voting or other purposes. This was the recommendation that was transmitted to the president. There was some objection to this in the chancellor's office on the basis of this allowing out-of-state students, in effect, to become in-state students within something like a year, and this would result in a significant reduction in the tuition that the university received. About twenty percent of our operating costs are from students. I've forgotten the figures, but it would involve something like—if all out-of-state students became in-state students, which they argue it effectively this would do—then, this would raise the tuition by a hundred and sixty-four dollars for every student to bring in the same amount of money to the University. So this would certainly be a significant raise, and it would be something like thirty-three percent of total costs of attending, if one assumes all of the fees and tuition fees, and so on, that are involved; sixty-some percent, I think, if you consider only tuition. But it's a significant addition, there's no question. And obviously, it's not the sort of thing that

the senate favored doing immediately. We suggested that we might as well recognize that the courts were striking down these unreasonable residency requirements, and that many have prognosticated that in the near future, we will not be able to have an out-of-state tuition requirement, and we thought it might be well to anticipate this kind of thing.

I presented essentially this viewpoint to the Board of Regents, and I have received the same arguments that had been earlier presented by the chancellor's office in a cabinet meeting for opposition to this. And subsequent to a vote of the board to table the whole matter until the next day, one member of the board, William Morris, chastised me for injecting the Faculty Senate—or, the faculty for injecting themselves, I think is the way he put it, into a matter that was none of their concern. He said he strongly resented this, and felt that this was purely a legal matter, an administrative matter, and the faculty's opinion was not needed. He told me that the only thing the faculty were interested in was more students so they could get more money so we could hire more professors. I did not reply to the charges when asked whether or not I wanted to.

Now, the next day, there was a motion by Clark Guild that effectively referred the whole matter to the May meeting of the Board of Regents, and a suggestion that they might want to tie the residency requirement to ownership of real property in the state above a certain minimum assessed value. I'm sure that there would be opposition from the senate on this point, but I anticipate the senate will not make any additional recommendations on this matter.

Dr. [Edgar F.] Kleiner was appointed last summer as an assistant dean [in the College of Arts and Science]. Dr. Kleiner came into

the field recently. He was an insurance man for quite a few years, and several years ago, got his Ph.D. at Utah and taught for one year as a temporary instructor at Montana, and then came here. And I know, outside the department as well as inside, there was some surprise that he'd been appointed as assistant dean. He came to us not so much by our solicitation, but as a result of a grant from Wilbur May, of \$20,000, to support his position for two years.

From the point of view of a department chairman, at least, the procedure in appointing him as assistant dean—from a purely administrative point of view—I don't approve of. I got a call at home from Dr. Kirkpatrick, who informed me that he had first talked over the possibility of appointing Dr. Kleiner to this position with the president. Then he talked it over with Dr. Kleiner, and Dr. Kleiner asked to have the weekend to think it over, and agreed to it, and then several days later, I got the call from Dr. Kirkpatrick asking me whether or not I thought this was a good idea.

I thought it was rather late to ask me my opinion, and with everyone else approving, I could hardly do otherwise. The reasons given to me for the appointment were that Dr. Kleiner has a low profile, a stable family life, and is new. And as an administrator, I would not regard those as sufficient reasons for appointing someone to an administrative position that involved, particularly, decisions on graduate programs and graduate contracts. This was one of the major items that Dean Kirkpatrick emphasized in his conversation to me.

I don't have any doubt about Dr. Kleiner's ability to learn what he has to learn for this position, but he had directed no graduate students, he had no experience in this area, and it seems a rather odd choice. But at any rate, I'm sure that he'll work out well in the

position. I've noticed wherever paperwork is involved, he seems to perform quite well. And if there are rules and regulations that have to be followed, I'm sure it'll work out well. He's a very good diplomat, and in terms of his relations with the students, I'm sure that he would have no problems there, but I did have some chagrin about the way in which the whole matter was handled.

The teacher-course evaluation was initiated this spring, and the senate—I don't recall its precise action on it, but there was some strong feeling, despite its approval in the senate, that one problem with teacher-course evaluation by only students is that this might tend to become eventually a popularity contest.

There's strong feeling on my part, and I submitted a document to the senate last year, when I was vice chairman, that administrators be evaluated by faculty. And the initial reception given to this was an attitude of awe that I would have the affrontery to do something like this, and caused a few snickers in the room, and I asked why, and someone said, "Well, you haven't thought of the repercussions." I wanted to know what repercussions, and, well, they said they were obvious.

So anyway, I persisted with this, in pushing the idea, although it gained no support at all initially from the senate, and in the document worked out during the summer, between the code committee and the subcommittee and the academic council, we discussed the notion of administrator evaluation by the faculty. Some were in favor of it, and one of those opposed to it initially was Dean Bohmont of the College of Agriculture. I pointed out to him that he was being evaluated all the time. The difference between what I proposed and the way in which it was being done now was that he simply didn't know what the

evaluation was, and if there was anything going wrong, he didn't have a chance to rectify it.

Well, apparently, he thought about it seriously. We eventually did include it in the compromise version worked out by this body, and those of us on the committee felt it was a good thing. But the end result is that Dean Bohmont did introduce an administrative evaluation of his own office, and it's also to be used to evaluate assistant deans and department chairmen within the College of Agriculture. I don't know what the results are, but the evaluation was carried out, I think early this—in the winter.

We had a member of the evaluation committee, the chairman of the evaluation committee in Agriculture, come to the senate and present the document that they had used for administrative evaluation, and the senate is now looking favorably on this kind of an evaluation, [and have] referred it to a committee for consideration. I'm hopeful that the next senate will have this resubmitted to it for approval of the senate. I feel if it is approved by the senate, there's a strong possibility that all administrators will be evaluated in this fashion. There have been recommendations in the literature. I saw one recently in Science, that not only should administrators be evaluated, but they should be subject to a recall vote, perhaps, every two or three years. This certainly would change the communication picture, I think, enormously in the university, particularly if the evaluation extended all the way up to the chancellor's level.

I think, with the new management revolution that seems to be taking place in most industry, there's a strong possibility that this management revolution—or participatory management, as it's called—will extend to the university, and that the kind of autocratic

administration that we are all familiar with in the past is very soon going to be extinct. It'll be resisted, obviously, by some elements in the administration, but I think it's inevitable that it's going to disappear, because you simply can't function in a complex organization like this as an administrator in the old political fashion, autocratic fashion, that was possible ten or fifteen years ago. At any rate, we like to think this is what's going to happen.

I feel, also, but I've been unsuccessful—totally unsuccessful, I should add—in getting the senate to go along with me that a major hiatus in the whole evaluation picture and attempt to improve the quality of teaching is our inability to adequately evaluate the teacher in the classroom. As a department chairman, I have the responsibility every year of evaluating for purposes of promotion and salary increases every one of the members of the department. And it's extremely difficult on the basis of a little bit of sampling I've been able to do, by sitting in on classes, to get any adequate feeling of the competence of the individual instructor. I have no way of knowing if I go into the class whether or not I'm shaking them up to the point that they really get disturbed about it. If they give a poor lecture, maybe I'm responsible.

In any event, I proposed a system which some have likened to 1984, and maybe it is. Maybe I'm wrong in even thinking about it, but I felt that—oh, just extrapolating from the experience in our department, we at one time had a problem with alcoholism, and another time a problem with tardiness and absence, and unless the student complains about things like this, why, generally, I don't know about them. And few students complain about the teacher not being there. They're only too happy to miss a class! So generally, you learn about it long after the event's occurred, and it's very difficult to evaluate just how severe the

problem is. So I proposed a small TV camera monitor in each room, each classroom.

What happens to academic freedom?

Well, yeah. This is exactly what people have said, that this interferes with academic freedom. And maybe they're right. Maybe I just am wrong-headed about this and so obsessed with trying to evaluate the people in my department that I've lost sight of more important goals. I don't think there's any question it can be misused to limit academic freedom. And the evaluation, if it were done by a TV monitor of this sort, would have to be very circumspect. But it might, in some ways, protect the teacher from unjust accusations about the quality of teaching, or digressions. I can think of instances in the past, we've heard stories of TF's who spent the time in other departments talking about the Vietnam war when they were supposed to be talking about some matter in English, perhaps. If that individual had been under a monitor at that time, it would've been easy to prove that that was not the case. Eventually, that developed, but it was much more difficult to demonstrate it. I'm not really sure, now, whether the possible evils of that kind of a system would outweigh the benefits.

In any event, I took the proposal to the Faculty Senate, and there was absolutely, positively no support for it, just none at all. And I think George Herman's comment with regard to it was apropos. He said, "Let's wait 'til 1984." So, in any event, I don't anticipate that it will come into being very soon. But I think we do need a better system of evaluation, however we do it, for teachers and individual departments. I've suggested that, as an alternative to this system, we might have a file of tests, and somehow, use the file to gather data at least about whether

the major concepts are being covered in individual courses.

About the aims and goals of higher education in Nevada, I think our goal should be the same as that of any other good university in the country, and that is to produce the best education that we can, given the facilities that we have. I think it's the faculty's obligation, of course, to fight for those facilities and operating funds that we feel we need to do the job.

A university should not be simply a trade school, and unfortunately, I think it is, in the minds of many people. It also should not be a status symbol—that is, the students going to the University shouldn't be here simply because they want a degree which they feel they have to have to achieve a certain status in society. It should serve a purpose.

I think we should have trade schools, and I think a community college can largely serve that call. There are many areas in which perhaps only two years of higher education is required beyond high school, and community colleges can do that. With the developing community college, there has been a fear expressed by the faculty that they will not do a quality job of education, and this fear [was] based upon the very low salary schedules that had been published for this year. There was some action in the senate, in fact, and a discussion with President Donnelly, who had been invited to one session of the senate. There was strong feeling that their salary figures should be higher in order to attract quality personnel, to avoid, as one senate member termed it, the "scab labor" who might be attracted. And the feeling was rather strong. I think maybe I may not be emphasizing the depth of feeling about it.

In any event, there is also some fear that community college is a redundant system. We would like to see it develop into

a complementary system, but not attempt to set up programs which are the duplicate of programs on the campuses. This, of course, bears on the whole matter of entrance requirements into the University. And there is a strong feeling by the registrar's office that entrance requirements should be raised. The senate has not, so far, approved—although I understand in the next session of the undergraduate council that recommendations for certain entrance requirements are going to come up again, proposed by the Academic Standards Committee and submitted, or at least developed to a large extent, in that committee by the consultant, Jack Shirley. Whether or not the undergraduate council will resist these again, I don't know. I think, very obviously, the tendency is to steer many of the students, those students who tend to be dropouts here, into the community college system and to use that as a screen for the University. There are many advocates, however, of an open admission policy for the University, and so these would obviously be in direct opposition to any attempt to raise entrance requirements.

There's a feeling that all of the entrance requirements are artificial, and that what ought to be measured is motivation, but there's no agreement about how you can measure that. So I would suspect that probably and eventually, because of economic reasons, if for no other reason, that we will have certain entrance requirements. But the faculty appear not to be very anxious to go along with them right now.

With other schools in the United States, I can compare Nevada with Michigan State University, University of Tennessee, Columbia University, and a small college, Florida Southern College, in Lakeland, Florida. I think in its devotion to learning, certainly, the University of Nevada comes nowhere

near Columbia University. I feel that we do not have the kind of academic orientation at some levels of the administration that we ought to have.

Michigan State University was such a large bureaucratic complex that it's difficult to compare it with anything. There are some 25,000 students, I guess, at Michigan State. And President Hannah at that time was a very effective president, but so far removed from the faculty, and so remote, that it was really very difficult to form much of an opinion. I think some departments were very active in Michigan State, as one would expect, and some were horribly antiquated. So I'd be at a loss to say whether we were better or worse. I think in terms of operating funds, we're certainly a lot worse. In terms of present salaries, we're worse than Michigan State.

How about quality of education?

Well, Michigan State was in the forefront at that time in the quality of education in the area I was very familiar with, and that was natural science. They were trying all sorts of new ideas. It's very difficult to get new ideas tried in many departments on this campus.

One real problem—and there are a lot of opinions about this—is that many departments have rotating chairmen. This almost insures that what's going to prevail is committee opinion about everything. And it's very difficult to get innovation from a committee. So leadership is—the way things are structured—leadership really is very difficult to exercise in most departments. I feel that, in some ways, the University really doesn't know where it's going. I feel that it hasn't been adequately explained to the community.

One of our big problems is the antipathy of the community towards the University,

the antipathy, particularly, of the local newspapers. I'm always impressed when I go to, oh, Salt Lake City, or Laramie, or places further east, with, in general, the local newspapers' coverage of university affairs, more extensive coverage, and good feeling— apparent good feeling between the university and the community. And that kind of a feeling seems to be almost totally lacking here. If anything happens at the University that is detrimental to the University, the local newspapers invariably seem to play this up to the University's detriment. I don't know whether they're simply doing this in the interest of news, or whether they realize what they're doing, whether they feel that the University is an economic drain on the state and this is one way of cutting down that economic drain—I don't know what the reasons are, but I think there's no question that they are largely responsible, along, possibly, with television, for the lack of interest and real antipathy towards the University on the part of many members of the community. And I think this is really unfortunate.

We talk about improving the public image of the University, but until those in control of the newspapers and television really make an effort, I think that our efforts on this campus cannot do very much towards this end.

I think notable is the lack of this kind of an attitude on the part of the Las Vegas newspapers towards the UNLV campus. There's strong support in Las Vegas for their campus, and it's just unfortunate that we can't see this kind of support expressed through the media here. Perhaps eventually it'll change. I hope so.

In terms of the University's needs—well, I think there are obvious needs: a bigger library, assurance that the medical school grows, but not at the expense of the rest of the University. There is still a strong fear that if anyone's

going to suffer, it's going to be the rest of the University before the med school does. And there is still an awful lot of opposition to the existence of a medical school on this campus. Justifiably, or unjustifiably, there is a fear that if things get really tight, the med school will not suffer, but the rest of us will.

Cited as an example of this is the growth of DRI. DRI is, of course—it's an ongoing fact. We can't turn the clock back, but many of us viewed this back in '59-'60 as a device set up primarily to stimulate research within departments. Instead, it grew into a separate organization. Initially, it was not dependent on state funds; now it is. And obviously, there are only so many people that can get into this trough, and there just aren't enough state funds to go around. And the feeling now is that we have a community college, we have DRI, we have UNR campus, UNLV campus, and then the med school, which may eventually have a budget amounting to almost as much as that of some of the divisions. We have all of these in the trough, and it's going to be difficult to supply all of them with funds.

So there's a question about whether we're responding to society's, [or] the state's needs, or the students' needs, or whether we're responding to certain administrative goals that somehow, sometimes, seem to be independent of the expressed needs of the students and the faculty. They seem to be related to political goals as much as to students' needs.

FACULTY SENATE
ATHLETIC PROGRAM STUDY COMMITTEE
KENNETH J. CARPENTER, MEMBER

Kenneth J. Carpenter: I am Kenneth Carpenter, Associate Director of Libraries, and I suppose that, at my suggestion, I am here because of my involvement with the Black student “upset” of last year, which subsequently resulted in my requesting from the Faculty Senate and obtaining a committee to study the role of the athletic program at the University.

I was chosen, or elected, or appointed—I don’t know which of the three—as a hearing officer according to the new regentially-imposed rules. After the thirteen Black students were arrested and banned from the campus (this was, I think, in October), I was chosen by lot as the hearing officer to determine whether their ban from the campus, and their expulsion, should remain until a more formal hearing. I was very restricted on this. My role was not to determine guilt, or determine fact, or law concerning the incident. My role was purely to determine whether it would be dangerous for the University if these students could be admitted back to class and allowed on

campus until there were formal hearings. It was a very restricted role.

Well, I conducted the hearing, the first time that I had ever done such a thing, and I broke some rules (I let people in that shouldn’t be), but I took my role fairly seriously. I thought, “Well, if this is what I’m supposed to do, I’m just going to go ahead and do it.” And so I went ahead and did it.

I talked to the thirteen students, and it was a fairly crowded room. They all had their advisors, and, of course, all thirteen were black, and, as I remember, about eight out of the thirteen were athletes—that is, they had been recruited to come to the University as athletes. And, as I say, my function had nothing to do with innocence or guilt, but—a very difficult one, as a matter of fact. I knew none of these students. I never had contact with any of them. Being a librarian, I don’t see many students.

Then, in the meeting, which was a fairly open meeting—although x did bend a rule or two to do this—to interrogate them, listen to their witnesses, listen to their advisors,

and decide whether it was safe to have these students on campus, I had a set of questions, and I queried them. They had their advisors, and their witnesses, and the result of my hearing was that I recommended to the president that all these students should be allowed back on campus until the formal hearing. We're only talking about two or three weeks, for crying out loud.

During the course of that [hearing], I began to hear a little bit about the kind of life they lived as a recruited athlete. Now, I've been around universities a few years, and being an old "knee-jerk liberal," I've always been against "athletic programs." I mean, this is part of the phenomenon, you know; you're always against professional athletics, like you're "always" against Nixon—this sort of thing. You know, you just take it for granted without really knowing anything of the details. Well, I started hearing some of the details from these students.

And then, I don't remember whether it was that same afternoon, or a day or so later—. Well, at any rate, as I promised to do, I gave my recommendation to the president that same evening, I believe, in writing, which was to allow the students back on campus as students, to attend class, and full privileges as students, because they would not impose a threat (which, of course, was the—at least, the legalistic reason why they were banned from campus). Then, I don't know whether it was the next day or not, the president followed my recommendations, except for I think about three students who had other charges.

Well, regardless of the right of this thing, the immorality or morality of that particular decision, I found out that, despite my recommendation, and despite the president's recommendation, [that] for some of the students, some mysterious "they" up there in the athletic program had forbade these

students to even practice. Even though I had recommended they be admitted as full students, and the president had admitted that they should come back as full students, I don't know whether it was the athletic director, but someone up there, who is in charge of this, had forbade those same students from having any part of the athletic program until the final hearing. This really ticked me off. You talk about double or triple jeopardy—to me, this seemed a complete and utter misuse of arbitrary decisions.

I called up the president. (I didn't find this out until about five o'clock one night. Some Black student called me up.) And I called him up in the middle of dinner, and I asked him, "What about this?" And he said that he didn't know what the rules were, [Or] by what power that the athletic director, or whoever it was, had forbade these students to—. Now, remember, these are people who come here to play. He didn't know.

And I thought, "Well, now, there's something mighty peculiar. The president of the University has no authority, or even knowledge of, the rule that some member of his faculty can forbid students to take part in a program that the University has gone out and recruited them here to do. Something's [laughing] mighty peculiar!"

Well, I have a short fuse, and unfortunately, I find that as I get older, and I look forward to retirement, I can get angry much more easily than when I was younger. So I got mad, and I allowed myself to stew about it a couple days, and then I came down [to the office] on a Sunday, and I typed a quite angry memorandum to the executive board of the Faculty Senate. And it was intemperate, and it was not a balanced memorandum. I accused—certainly by implication—the coaches of—well, I've forgotten now what it was. I accused them [of] maybe what the

regents would like to call moral turpitude—I don't know. But anyway, it was indiscreet.

To: Executive Council, Faculty Senate
From: Kenneth J. Carpenter
[Date: November 5, 1971]

I have been a concerned observer of, and an occasional participant in, the conflict between black students and the University of Nevada, Reno, during the past few years. Being a middle-aged conservative with standards of conduct established by an earlier generation, I have frequently been critical of the actions, as well as the language, of black students in recent years. I believe in such old-fashioned concepts as decorum, for example, and "good" manners. I still, despite our history of the last twenty years, believe that fighting within established rules is the proper way. At least for me it is. I could not, myself, in any way participate in or even condone such tactics as physically occupying an office and daring the establishment to retake it by force. I do not believe in the efficacy of "confrontation." I find personally distasteful some of the language used by pickets and speakers. And on and on.

HOWEVER, I understand very well the reasons for the tactics used by many blacks throughout the United States. I would not use them, but I understand why blacks do, and I find some of their arguments used to justify them very difficult to refute. But I would like to address myself here to the situation at the University.

The recent disturbance on campus caused by black students and the

"demands" made by them to the President are depressingly familiar to anyone who has followed the course of our country during the past few years. We have seen it all before, we have heard it all before. And so have the blacks. But it need not have happened here. As usual, we are years behind the rest of the United States. But instead of taking full advantage of lessons taught elsewhere, we have enjoyed our comparative quiet and peace and, if we considered the problem at all, lazily hoped that it would never happen here—or at least quietly to go away. Well, it is here and it probably won't go away.

And I believe the fault lies squarely with the University of Nevada, Reno, itself; not with President Miller solely, not only with curriculum committees, not only with ASUN, but with all of us. Specifically, I am talking about the University of Nevada, Reno's, practice of recruiting black athletes from around the country to come here and once they are here forget about them except to show some concern that they maintain a 2.0 average and show up for practice and at game time. I do not have any statistics to back up what I am saying and I may be doing some people an injustice. I really hope so. But in the nine and a half years I have been here, I have yet to hear of the University as such, and more specifically its agent in this case, its athletic department, ever coming to the aid of a black student who was being hurt for being black. Oh, I am sure that extra financial aid has been given at times and that quiet intervention has been made to

raise grades, but that is not what I am concerned about. I know of several faculty members and members of the community to whom black students go when they are in trouble. I have yet to hear of one of them going to the people who brought them here.

Soon thirteen black students are going to undergo a hearing which will determine whether or not they will be absolved of charges, suspended, or expelled. The faculty members who know them best are members of the athletic department. How many of them will be called as character witnesses at that hearing? How many will volunteer? How many sports supporters among our alumni will volunteer their aid to men they helped bring to Reno?

The present problem, the case of the famous thirteen, will be handled properly, according to all the rules and regulations, which I think are fair enough. But regardless of the outcome, whether or not the thirteen are allowed to remain in school or are suspended or expelled, the basic unfairness will in no way be done away with.

I believe that until the University as such is willing at least to alleviate the situation of a black student in Reno, it should immediately cease recruiting black athletes.

I ask that the Faculty Senate immediately institute an investigation of the athletic recruiting program of the University as it pertains to blacks and the institutional support given to them after they are in Reno.

There are several members of the faculty who agree with my position

and if the Council is at all inclined to consider the possibility of such an investigation, we would be glad to meet with you at your convenience to discuss it further.

I sent this to the executive board of the senate. A few days went by, and I got a telephone call from Hugh Mazingo, the chairman of the Senate, and he said, "Ken," he said to this effect, "We're all for you, and what I've done is reproduce this letter and sent [it] to all members of the Senate."

Well, [laughing] this kind of put me on the spot. I like Hugh (I've known him for some time), and I didn't call him all the names that I probably should have at the time! I kinda put up with it. Well, the result was that this intemperate letter, which was not meant for public distribution, was sent out to all members of the Faculty Senate. As a result, of course, within two and a half minutes, it was in the hands of—oh, the sports man for Channel Eight, Ted Dawson. So, immediately, it got on the television. It got in the papers. It got on the UP, or one of the national wire services, and [was] reprinted all over the country.

Needless to say, this was extremely embarrassing to me, so I arranged to have a proxy to be a member of the senate the next meeting. I went to the senate meeting on November the eighteenth with Mr. Morehouse's proxy, and I presented this statement and the following one with the motion. That started the whole thing off.

The November 5 memorandum from me that has been distributed to you was not meant to be a public document. It was sent to the Executive Council and designed to elicit a particular action. The action was forthcoming, but I was surprised by its

vigor and speed. That memorandum was, at least in part, ill considered, certainly indiscreet and not very well argued. (Mr. Trachok's public charge that I had not done my home work was justified and I appreciate his restraint.) If I had known that what I wrote was to be distributed to this body, I think it would have been more along the following. For the present discussion, therefore, I ask that the following statement (which has been distributed to you) be substituted in its stead.

* * * * *

November 18, 1971
To: The Faculty Senate
From: Kenneth J. Carpenter

I think it obvious that in 1971 universities in the United States are at a critical juncture in their history. We have all read of unrest, not only on the part of students but also on the part of the public that pays the bill. It seems to me that in this time of financial troubles and growing dissatisfaction with institutions of higher education, it is necessary to engage in a program of self-evaluation; self-evaluation by this faculty, a body of men and women trained in the arduous techniques of fact-finding, trained in the classical methods of analysis, synthesis and reporting. A body of men and women whose daily job it is to investigate, analyze, synthesize and report. I believe it necessary that we exercise our talents and training in establishing the relevancy of what we do, establishing proper priorities,

and justifying what the state is paying for in terms of the basic functions of the university: teaching, research and public service.

We have been doing this in some areas during the past couple of years—with mixed results. One of our activities, however, has largely been ignored. I am speaking of the university's athletic program. Although I am fairly knowledgeable about many of the programs conducted on this campus and have a fairly good idea of their purpose, conduct and cost (for example, teaching and research problems in various schools and colleges), I have not the slightest knowledge of the purpose, conduct or cost of the athletic program. For a quarter of a century I have been involved in universities, all of which have had athletic programs. I, along with many of my colleagues, have opposed these programs, and criticized them; but few of us have had facts or have had clear and unequivocal statements as to their purpose in a university. I am ignorant and wish to be informed.

I am, therefore, requesting this faculty to conduct a study of the athletic program of this university. I cannot do my homework without a text and I wish to be furnished one to study.

I move that: this senate appoint a faculty committee to study the role of the athletic program of this university and report its findings to the faculty. This study should include, but not be limited to, the role the program plays in the basic functions of the university (Teaching, research and

public service); the cost of the program (including an analysis of not only the amount but the source of funds, distribution and principles on which the distribution is made); and the effect of the program on students who are recruited, especially with reference to their academic experience at the university.

Arid so that's how the whole thing began. Now, the only reason I think that it might be of some interest to have this in this year's account is that it might result in a memorandum, or some kind of fussing around next year, because this committee [the Faculty Senate's Athletic Program Study Committee], of which I am now a member, will probably not give a report to the senate until December or January of next year.

As it stands now, the committee has been appointed, and we're meeting weekly. John Marschall is the chairman. Members: myself, John Malone, Ann Cattelain, Kenneth Loeffler, Pete Perriera—. Let's see, Edwin S. Dodson from education is a consultant, Henry Hattori is a consultant. I have a feeling I left someone out. Oh, and Alex Boyd; he was a Black student, a Black athlete on the basketball team, one of the finest we've ever had. He is now on the staff and working, I believe, somewhere in Student Services. This is strictly a faculty committee, at my request. It has nothing to do with students. It has nothing to do with the administration. It is strictly a faculty committee that is going to report to the faculty.

Then there's the Richardson case. We won ones [laughing] You know, you can't lose 'em all. I was very interested in that, and being involved in it, to some extent. Jim is a person I've known the last few years, a man who I admire. I think it took a lot of guts for him to do what he did. For him, personally, and

probably for this University, I am glad that it ended the way it did—that is, by an out-of-court settlement. Thinking nationally, I kind of regret that it didn't go to a court decision, because I think it could have established a precedent. But I'm glad it came out the way it did.

Ruth G. Hilts: The news report said that the agreement grants Richardson everything he asked for except that each party will pay its own costs. Has this been very expensive for him, do you know?

I don't know. We, of course, raised money for Jim on this. As a matter of fact, I think I was probably as—. Someone else is supposed to be the treasurer, but it never came to that. We raised money—oh—oh, quickly. The first time when we met, Friday, I think we promised Rich five hundred dollars by Monday, and we did it. Then the thing was that this was to retain Paul Bible. But then if it were necessary to go on for a long, extended court case, then we were going to form a permanent committee to get more money. But this was not necessary.

The new National Society for Professors: I have, philosophically, been opposed to unions, in the classical sense, on campus, apart from workers. I have always thought of teachers and librarians in the true sense of profession. I've always regarded myself, I've regarded a professor in the physics department, in the sense of a professional, as an independent contractor who exercises his profession according to law and established standards and ideals. And the militant—well, I shouldn't say militant, but the organized "union" idea—. By the way, I'm an old Wobbly man, so I know what unions are like; "the one great union" was not a part of professionalism.

And as a matter of fact, some years ago, an AFL-CIO man came here, and there was a meeting, and I attended it. And I wouldn't be surprised but [what] my antagonism at the time largely killed that early movement. I'm definitely against it.

On the other hand, I'm not a pure idealist. I won't go all the way. I'm also a compromiser, and recognize that one must meet some of the realities of (the) modern world, perhaps with tools that one would not ordinarily choose if the world were a better place. I'm reminded—thinking of this—as I say, I knew lots of Wobblies, and was in a few nasty movements during Depression years in the fruit orchards in the San Joaquin Valley, and the apple country in Oregon and Washington. I was also at Berkeley during the McCarthy days. But nevertheless, despite that experience, I have always considered a union not a part of the professions.

However, I think I'm going to change my mind; I think if I am solicited to become a member of the local chapter of the NEA, or whatever it is, I might well join. [The National Society for Professors] is a chapter of NEA, an organization that I've never had any particular admiration for, being a part of the University. If I were an elementary school teacher or a high school teacher, I would, because they don't have such things as the AAUP, and the idea of professionalism that we have, or should have.

But considering what's happened here in the last few years, the almost complete—it's more than contempt that the Board of Regents shows for this faculty, together with the almost complete lack of power or authority of our administrators, the president and the chancellor, or against the Board of Regents, that if one is really interested in the University, one's role in the University, the role of the faculty in the University, it seems

that we're almost forced into joining with an organization that, as I say, in a more beautiful, more perfect world, one would not even pay attention to.

Now, this is the old, sad story of confrontation and polarization. And it's certainly happened. Of course, it happened here many years ago, during the Stout administration. Then things got better under Charlie Armstrong, who, despite what people thought of him, and despite his rather authoritarian manner, I think was one of the healthiest things that ever happened to the University of Nevada. Since then, why, that polarization has occurred again. And if polarization is thrust upon one, one must choose one's poles. And if my colleagues, some of whom know more than I do, choose this route—

As I told the senate yesterday, I would never appear before the Board of Regents unless I were legally subpoenaed to do so—not appear before them as a witness, to give information, to present anything for the faculty. I would, under no circumstances, do so. I would not subject myself to such an indignity! I am talking specifically of "Wildcat" Morris's response to the chairman of our Faculty Senate, Pugh Mozingo, last Saturday. So that's my view of this union business.

The role of a university, or higher education, whatever that might be, in Nevada, and my idea of what universities should be? Well, despite my association with the "left," I'm very, very conventional. My standards have been set by the generations that preceded me. I have very conventional ideas about many things, and education in universities is one of them. I have chosen to devote my life to the university. I have never regretted it. I've been very fortunate. I think it is an institution in our society that is an admirable one, and if

I'm going to devote my life to fightin' fights, and workin', and giving my fifty—if our hours a week, or whatever my average is, why, I couldn't think of anything I'd rather do it for than a university.

You're thinking of the traditional academic university—or do you consider it a growing thing that has to change with the needs?

Well, like any other kind of an institution, it has to do a little bit of both. I never believed in revolution for revolution's sake, because one cannot change things overnight. Again, I'm conventionally devoting my life to a library, to the history of printing, to the development of language—which, obviously, I'm conservative. These things could not exist without a past. If one does away with them, there isn't anything. And a university is a good part of the same tradition, it seems to me, starting with Padua in the eleventh century, and through Paris, and Cambridge, Oxford, and, of course, from the German tradition, too. One cannot escape the view that the role of the university today has come out of this long tradition. Now, one can be mighty unhappy about the difficulty of changing it overnight, but one can also be very, very unhappy if one were able to change it overnight, it seems to me. Like anything else in a democratic society—you know, democracy's the worst way of managing anything, but it's better than anything else [laughing], to paraphrase Mr. Churchill. You can just get so damn mad about it, but like a man said about living, "It's not very good, but the alternatives are [laughing] all too deplorable to contemplate!"

I'm sympathetic with these youngsters. Fortunately, I have a good memory. I remember how I felt when I was sixteen, seventeen, eighteen, and twenty. 'Course, when I was eighteen, nineteen, I was a bum

on the road and going from job to job during the Depression years, running alcohol over the Montana border, and unloading banana boats in New Orleans, and [laughing] things like that. But nevertheless, I know.

You see, what makes it so nice at my age [is] that I can still be a rebel, but I've got it made, you know. It's much easier for me than, say, a twenty-year-old student. I'm sympathetic with this idea of change, but I'm also very, very sympathetic with those who, like me, measure our actions [and] gauge our decisions against a long tradition in the Western world. And it seems to me that you have to balance one against the other. You've got to be able to say, "Well, it's time to change it," but at the same time, if someone wants to come and change it, one has to be able to fight and say, "Well, this has been going on for a long time, and it's given us a lot, and maybe we can modify it, but let's not blow it up."

As far as Nevada's concerned, I think the University is in a very difficult position. I love it in Nevada. I've been here ten years now. I would never live anywhere else. But it's very frustrating if one is as devoted, as I am, to an intellectual life, to life in the university, to live in Nevada. It's very easy for me to live on the campus, because my friends feel the way I do; otherwise, of course, they wouldn't be my friends. But I find it very difficult to meet the political realities, or the cultural realities, of Nevada qua Nevada. I love its mountains, I love its people, I love its deserts—as you know, few people know more about [laughing] it than I do. I'm completely devoted to it. But when I listen to the Raggios, and the Barretts, and the Jacobsens, and even the O'Callaghans, and so on, I get very weary and a little bit disgusted. And the cowboys, the—what do they call them?—the Sundowners, and so forth, the anti-intellectual force in this community is really quite depressing.

Now, God knows, it exists in California. And, of course, I've spent most of my life in California, and then I was twelve years at the University of California at Berkeley before I came here. We have the Reagans and the Raffertys, and so forth, but oddly enough, despite their ability to command the headlines, despite their ability to modify budgets, when one lives in Berkeley, when one lives in the Bay area, one is not so immediately surrounded by the same kind of anti-intellectualism that one is in Nevada. It's like Nevada geology—it's so obvious! You know, it's there! There're no trees to cover it up [laughing]. But I love it.

I think the University here is—it's a question of size. If this University were larger and older, I'd be less worried. This is one of the great things about the University of California. It is so big. It has an inertia, of size and years, that even Reagan in eight years—. Now, he could hurt it, he can put some dents in it, but he can't essentially, in very important ways, change the University of California. It's just too big, too old, too massive, too strong. The University of Nevada, I'm not so sure.

But I'm essentially, despite my cynical remarks and my studied sardonicism, I am essentially hopeful—I'm a positive thinker, really. Otherwise, I wouldn't be here [laughing]. As I said, despite my expression of worry about the anti-intellectualism that is so noticeable in Nevada, I do not mean to indicate that I think this is Nevada, or that it is so strong that it's going to completely destroy the University of Nevada. I don't think that will happen for several reasons: one, most of the people you hear about, the people that are in the headlines in the Gazette or that're on the television, the Dan Hansens, and so on and so forth, are people who "happened" to get in the headlines or on television. They're not the people who really support

the University of Nevada or who could really destroy it.

Alter all, now, I scream like mad every two years because the University's budget isn't increased, because the Library doesn't get what it needs, and so forth. But [laughing] let's be practical. Look at the record. I can't quote you the exact figures, but if you go back the last eight, ten years, the biennial increase of support for the University has risen at a greater rate, say, than the cost of living—than almost anything. This is true. Now, I can argue like hell that the money's going to the wrong place—I mean, such as the medical school, or Las Vegas, or [the] athletic program, and doesn't come to the Library [laughing] —but the people of the legislature have supported the University.

What was it last year? We were screaming like mad, and, of course, this campus got cut, and the Library got cut more than the campus. But the University, as a university, got, what, twenty-three percent? twenty-one percent? sixteen percent? something like that—increase over the previous biennium. So if the people who are so publicly critical of the University were really heeded, this wouldn't happen, [and] so I don't believe that it's in that kind of danger. I think it's in the danger that—now, frankly, there're two elements: one is what [do] the people of Nevada want from the University? And, two, the people don't understand what a university's about. The Board of Regents, largely, doesn't know what a university is about. Now, I don't want to make a blanket rule on that; I think there are a couple— I think Fred Anderson does, I think Molly [Knudtsen] does, I think [James] Bilbray does. But most of the people, they have no conception of what a university is about, even though they went here and got their bachelor's degree and went out and started

selling secondhand automobiles. But they don't know what a university is about.

On the other hand, T can sit up here on the roof of this University and point to office after office after office of faculty members on this University that don't know a damn thing about what a university's about [laughing]. So you can't just divide the world, you see, into "town and gown," and, "the town is bad and the gown is good." I know librarians who have a history major [or] an English major. They don't know what a university's about, either (I hate to say it—or even what a library's really about). They're technically proficient. They're good people. But in the sense in which I think of a university—or the Larry Lairds, or the Robert Gorrells, or the Walter Clarks—in which we think of a university, and books, and libraries—those people don't understand.

There was something else that you asked me, what people expect of a university. I think, in a sense, that in a good university-community relationship, that a university should teach the people what they should expect from a university, if they don't know. And perhaps this is part of our fault. Now, it's very easy to get in the headlines if we have a very good basketball team. This is no problem. This University has tried. Edd Miller's tried. We have this bureau of speakers, and so forth—. I don't know whether this works or not. And I've been, for instance, on a couple of these panels that Sam Basta has organized at the Center [for Religion and Life] in the last year—you know, to bring people from town, and students, and faculty, together—and frankly, I think they're an unmitigated disaster! I would never go to one again, because—. Maybe it's the format. But—they sit there, and if you say—. And people just kind of fortify their incapsulation, instead of real—instead of opening up.

When you get me talking, I can open up. You know, I can really talk, and really try to express what I feel. But when I get into [a discussion] with Raggio, as I did at one time, I cannot—I literally cannot communicate. Absolutely not! Now, part of it, undoubtedly, is my fault. I'm an intellectual snob. There's no doubt about it. But I try to handle it and manage it (and I can if I'm out in the desert—you know). But with the Raggios in the world, I can't—[laughing]. And I think this is part of the problem of people ma university. I sometimes blame people—you know, whatever this "people" thing we're talking about— [for] not coming to the University and finding out what we're doing. But then I think, "Well, why should they, unless there is something happening here that will attract them to do so?"

Now, this, interestingly enough, is true of the Board of Regents. I know of only one member of the Board of Regents who has ever actually come in and used the Library. This would be Fred Anderson, who years ago was interested in the history of medicine in Nevada. (And Wildcat Morris came in to accost me about the athletic program when I was on vacation.) But they don't know anything about the Library. And yet, this is, what, six percent of their budget? seven percent? And now we're asking for a three million-dollar addition. They don't know anything about the Library.

Although the Library is in good shape, as far as the morale, the people are concerned, it's becoming more and more evident that the institutional support of the Library is becoming more inadequate. Although it may increase slightly each year, it cannot meet its obligations. When the University of Nevada at Reno was required by formula to cut, what, four percent? four and a half percent? the Library was cut almost six percent. We

lost over four people, we cut our operating down—and this, at a time when the demands on it is vastly increasing. The national standards, for instance, say that we should be able to seat twenty-five percent of the student body. We can seat roughly twelve percent. Even by the chancellor's own conservative formula standards, our staff should be a hundred and one, whereas we're not at seventy—an increase, a dramatic increase. The book budget and operating the staff is amazingly low—by any standard. And as a matter of fact, the support of the Library—in relationship to the other demands on the campus—is probably one of the lowest I know of, except, maybe, Buildings and Grounds. Some figures that I have show that my people in the Library are operating at roughly thirty to thirty-five percent higher than the national standards in terms of work being produced, and this can't continue for any great length of time.

Fortunately, we have no trouble in support by the faculty, or the president, or the chancellor, or the Board of Regents, who have all recommended adequate support for the Library. Believe it or not, the regents, as conservative as they are, and Neil Humphrey, as fiscally conservative as he is, recommended in his last biennium budget to Carson City that the staff of the Library be increased by twenty-five people, over the seventy that now exist. No unit in the whole university system got such a recommendation.

The trouble is in Carson City with Mr. O'Callaghan and Mr. Barrett, who swear up and down that we've got too many books here now. We almost got slaughtered on the book budget. But fortunately, with the help of students, with faculty, and the alumni organization (Coe Swobe, especially), we did get the book budget back up to—at least we could live with it. The Library is in bad shape,

very bad shape, but fortunately, we have good people to work with, so we can live with it.

And, of course, [as to] my personal part of it, why, I've gotten back into teaching again. And I'm enjoying teaching very, very much. My wife and I gave our press* to the University, and this is one of the big things in our year. It's a good place to work. It's a good bunch of people. And it's a good library, too.

*Columbian press, made by Clymer and Dixon in 1837, donated to the University on October 15, 1971, by Kenneth and Patricia Carpenter, now housed in Getchell Library.

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS BOARD
PROFESSOR ANTHONY L. LESPERANCE,
CHAIRMAN

Anthony L. Lesperance: My name is Anthony Lesperance. I'm usually referred to as Tony. I hold a three-way appointment within the College of Agriculture, teaching, research, and extension. I currently am an associate professor. I have been involved with the Intercollegiate Athletic Board for close to ten years. I was on the board as a member for eight years, and I've pretty well grown up with the board as it presently exists. I left two years ago for a sabbatical leave. The following year, after returning to the Reno campus, I was not on the board, and throughout most of this period of time, Gene Kosso—Eugene Kosso, in electrical engineering— was chairman of the board. He left this year on a sabbatical leave, and so, at the initiation of the current academic year in September, I assumed the chairmanship of the athletic board—the Intercollegiate Athletic Board. This [board] reports to the president.

Any number of, I would say, rather significant things have happened this year. For one thing, the size of the board has increased rather dramatically, with the

inclusion of five students. We also have representatives from outside groups. We have an alumni representative, as well as a Boosters representative. (In the last five years, the Wolfpack Boosters Association has become very active, and has made a considerable financial allotment to the athletic program. I believe this last year \$45,000 was given to the athletic program by the Boosters.) So we have a rather large athletic board. I think there's currently twenty-one members.

Because of the size, we've changed the philosophy of the board somewhat. We do not hold regular meetings; rather, I try to get much of the leg work done and then have two or three meetings a year to approve the policies or procedures which I have initiated.

It has long been my philosophy that we need certain guidelines within the university—perhaps that's not the correct word—but we need certain goals, certain rules, and certain regulations. I'm a firm believer that we have to have a certain amount of discipline within our society here in this community, in the academic community, and

I've tried to use this athletic board to further—not necessarily to further my own beliefs, but to—I essentially try to run the athletic board with these thoughts in mind, and I think they apply to my philosophy of what the athletic program should be.

I view the athletic program on any land grant university, or any major college, as a very important function of that university. I consider it a university-wide program. It doesn't represent any particular area, such as the physical education department; rather, I think it—in fact, I don't even think it really represents the students, although students, of course, are the main contributing factor to it. I think a good, strong athletic program can be one of the best advertisements a university has. In my position here, within the College of Agriculture, I travel around the state considerably. I probably travel 40,000, maybe 50,000 miles a year within the state of Nevada in my work. And I have, what I think, a tremendous contact with the people in the state. In my contacts with people, I know that—maybe it's not right, but nevertheless—people associate a university a great deal with their athletic teams. And one of the first questions that people ask you, for example, you go to Battle Mountain, or Lund, or Alamo, or Tonopah, or McDermitt—I don't care where you go—and people start talking about the University, [and] they're concerned about the athletic program. And this always arises. Maybe it shouldn't be; maybe they should be far more concerned on the effectiveness of your teaching program in English or agriculture, or whatever it may be. But they still relate back to the athletic program. And consequently, a successful athletic program, in my mind, is a very, very good advertising point to the public for your university. And I've always felt this, and I have felt it very, very strongly this year. And I've felt that we do have

a good, sound athletic program in the fact that we do have nine or so recognized sports (I forget the exact number) and we do get a lot of good publicity out of it.

To back up a while, we were, of course, formerly in the Far Western Conference, which is primarily a conference of state universities in California. We could not operate very effectively in there, as we were competing directly with state colleges in California in major population areas that had very little problem in recruiting because they did not have very expensive fees, and didn't have to pay out-of-state tuition, this type of thing, because they were relying on their local population. For us to compete under these circumstances was very difficult. Several years ago, I put a lot of effort into the philosophy that we should perhaps leave the Far Western Conference. I felt that we should leave it and look for a conference in which we could more realistically compete in. We usually—oh, we won the basketball conference several times, and we usually did fairly well in football, and routinely won in track. But I felt we were not getting too much for our money. I thought we might get into a little more prestigious conference. We considered the Big Sky Conference. They very actively recruited us. We felt that the costs of this type of thing were too great because of the travel commitments, and I think we were most fortunate to find a spot in the WCAC, which we're currently in—the West Coast Athletic Conference—in which, of course, a number of well-known schools in California [belong]—Santa Clara, University of San Francisco, St. Mary's, Loyola, Pepperdine, now Seattle, as well as the two universities in Nevada. I think it makes a tremendous conference. It's a very, very strong basketball conference; it has a fairly strong baseball program, and then a lesser program in track and tennis. This caused us to have to

become independent in football, but I think that we, by our scheduling, have developed a stronger football program because of it.

Well, as I say, my philosophy is to have as strong a program as possible. Now, during this period of time, our basketball program, under head coach Jack Spencer, suffered considerably. A number of problems arose here. I tried to work with Mr. Spencer. I have a high regard for him, I consider him as a friend, but the program was running into problems mainly from his recruiting standpoint. His primary area of recruitment has been in the Midwest, rather than in the state of Nevada, or adjoining areas in California, where we probably could have got much more for our money in recruiting.

The problem, as I saw it developing, was that we not only were doing a poor job in recruiting, but we were recruiting people to this campus in our basketball program, which I think the events of this last year found, that didn't necessarily fit in with the philosophy. That is, we did recruit a number of Black student athletes. And, of course, I don't need to comment on the problems which developed around some of these at the initiation of the school year. My philosophy is that when these students became involved in the campus unrest, taking over certain offices within the student union [building] and then calling attention to their own plight by essentially forcing themselves to be evicted, created a problem which brought considerable bad publicity to the University. It not only brought bad publicity to the University, I think it cast a bad shadow on our athletic program, and further, I think it questioned the basic philosophy of our athletic program.

My opinion was, as chairman of the faculty athletic board, that these students, if indeed proven guilty, should be suspended from future competition for at least one year

in the basketball program. I further felt that they should not be allowed to compete in the interim period, because even though it was a question of whether they were guilty or not, they did bring about their public eviction by a rather large police force. I was deeply involved in the entire week's proceedings, working with the coaches, trying to bring some degree of organization to this whole process in hopes that the final confrontation could be avoided, but obviously, it wasn't. I felt that it was handled very well by President Miller, as well as the combined police forces which acted. I was disappointed in the fact that so little charges were brought against these people. In my mind, the act which they did, even though it tried to bring attention to their particular problem—and I won't comment on their problem in regards to office space—I think that their means of bringing attention to their predicament was entirely wrong. It was an open violation of the law, and it brings about, in many peoples' mind, the fact that it shows a complete disrespect for the law. And this was my feeling in my position as chairman of the athletic board.

I attempted to bring about their suspension from the program. They were not permanently suspended. Most of them were reinstated. And, of course, as the basketball season wore by, most of them were dropped for academic deficiencies. Some were involved in later problems, including dope charges, and this type of thing, and in general, the end result to our basketball program for this particular year was a rather disastrous season in which we only won two games, in which, actually, we were in violation of rules during these two games, and both games could be forfeited—and may still be if charges are brought by either of these two schools of which we won. They have not been brought by either of these two schools at this time, and I do not intend to

pursue this further. If we can at least salvage [laughing] these two wins this year, why, we'll let it go at that.

Now, this year, of course, was one of a series of three years in which our basketball program was continually going downhill. I forget the exact record, but in the last two years we won five games and lost in the neighborhood of forty-seven. Something like that. At the end of this year, I think we were the bottom one or two ranked university teams, major university teams, in the United States, and, of course, there are literally hundreds of teams in this category.

This brings to mind some rather, I think, important questions as to how you can change your athletic program at a time like this. Mr. Spencer had tenure in his position with the physical education department. Although his position as head coach could be changed, he obviously— probably— could not be removed from the staff by firing because he had indeed performed his duties exactly as they were prescribed in his contract—that is, that he teach, do an effective job teaching, which he does, as well as be the head football coach. In other words, he was indeed fielding a basketball team, even though it was not successful. Therefore, I used a somewhat different tactic. I encouraged, from off campus, interest in the possibility of bringing enough pressure to bear upon the administration within the intercollegiate athletic department to bring about a change in the coaching assignments.

At first, there was some reluctance on the part of Mr. Trachok to do this. Understandably so. We were involved in some rather delicate policies, and one is, of course, that Mr. Trachok and Mr. Spencer were close friends, and I indeed realize the problems here. It can't be accomplished just that easily. But nevertheless, we did bring about enough

interest on the part of the athletic board to make a unanimous recommendation at the termination of the 1972 basketball campaign that Mr. Spencer be removed from his duties as head basketball coach, and that, in turn, the president, by whatever means necessary, hire, or come up with the money that would be necessary to hire, a new head basketball coach, rather than just simply reassigning duties within the present staff of the physical education department, as well as the intercollegiate athletic area. The reason we couldn't do this was that it takes a very unique individual to make this kind of a transition. In other words, we cannot just simply go and say, "All right, you're going to be the head basketball coach now," to anybody in there because there probably isn't that man, with the exception of the present assistant basketball coach, who may very well have capably filled this position. (I felt he could have.) But then he in turn would have ended up without an assistant, and this would only compound our problems.

The feeling was that if we went through the change of assignment, we had to get a top-notch person to immediately build a team for next year. This was the philosophy of the entire movement when it was presented to President Miller. President Miller said we could hire a new head basketball coach. In other words, we did come up with a position. As I understand, this actually was at the expense of a new position for an assistant football coach, but hopefully, we will get that reinstated.

There was tremendous nation-wide interest in this position. I believe there were over a hundred people actually express interest in the basketball coach. There were some eighty-eight people applied, of which there were some outstanding individuals. In our opinion, the committee to screen the

candidates—I'm not sure exactly what the name of the committee was, but there was five or six people on this committee, myself, as chairman of the board was on it; as well as three coaches; the athletic director, of course, Dick Trachok; as well as a couple of people representing outside interests from the Boosters organization and a student representative. We screened the eighty-seven people that applied, and were most fortunate in selecting what I hope will show to be a very, very outstanding person. That is Jim Padgett, who was previously head basketball coach at the University of California at Berkeley. This individual, I think, will make an outstanding contribution. And again, only time will tell. But I, at this point in time, would feel that this person will make an outstanding contribution to the University community. He is not only an outstanding coach, has tremendous knowledge of the game, he is an outstanding recruiter, and his record has shown him to be very, very successful with working with all people. He does not operate under dual standards. He operates under a single standard, but in the process of doing this in the past, he has been very successful, a recruiter of minority groups, as well as just outstanding basketball players. He chooses not to look at minority groups, as such; he considers all people equal. And I think that this philosophy is extremely important in our university.

(I might just comment on the fact that I'm not enthusiastic about our encouragement of minority groups as such. I think we should encourage simply students as such, and not place so much emphasis on the fact that we are putting money into certain minority areas. Indeed, I'm quite violent against this.)

Nevertheless, we were successful in hiring Mr. Padgett, and I think that he and his wife will make a tremendous contribution to this

entire area, and especially to the University community. Again, only time will tell on this. It will be interesting in five years to look back at this because I would think that he will make this contribution.

Now, a number of other things happened during this year, which affected, I think, many segments of the campus in regards to our athletic policy. There has been considerable unrest on the students' part. There was a question on their continued funding of the program. I believe that each student pays—I forget the exact amount—seven dollars and fifty cents, or is it fifteen dollars a year—whatever it is. There was considerable resentment on their part for the continued automatic donation of this money. In other words, they thought maybe that it could be on a voluntary basis.

This is not unique at this campus. You find this [at] almost all major campuses, the same philosophy being considered. And I think there's good reason, both pro and con, for this discussion. I think it's important to note that the students are at least taking an active interest, and that, of course, I would encourage at all times. But I think our problems with the students were compounded by the fact that we had a very frustrating experience with our athletic program this year, and primarily, I think, attention was focused on it by the basketball team. I suspect that if we had a very successful basketball team, we would not have had the opposition from students which we encountered.

This is not ironed out yet, and I- think we have to progress on this quite a bit more. I've appointed a subcommittee which is responsible to me, consisting of two students and two faculty members, to investigate the continued student contribution of money to the athletic program. I would like a lot of questions on this answered. I think the

students should at least have a much stronger say in how this money is used in relationship to the athletic program. This subcommittee has met a couple of times this year, and I would hope that it would be much more actively involved next year. I plan to put more emphasis on this financial subcommittee for my own use next year in formulating philosophies of the athletic board, and how it can function, or serve, to produce a better athletic program. So this is one of the things that resulted from this.

Another thing which I think developed from our athletic program this year, which brought a lot of attention, is that there was a lot of faculty questioning as to whether, indeed, there should be an athletic program, even (an intercollegiate athletic program). This point was raised by a number of people on this campus. It was raised at the University Faculty Senate, of which I am still a member of. I was a member of senate for three years before I left for a sabbatical, and after I came back I was elected for another three-year term, this being the first year. And this was raised very actively at the senate, has been considered in the Financial Aids and Scholarship Boards, of which I am a member of, and I think that it has been raised on two or three other areas within the University community. The outcome of this—at one time I think I counted four or five different committees or subcommittees on this campus which, during the year, were actively investigating the role of intercollegiate athletics, or the continuation of it, as such.

I have tried to make the information from the faculty athletic board available to the senate at all times. The senate chose to appoint their own committee to investigate athletics, and it is in the process of investigating the overall intercollegiate athletic program at this time. I was in opposition to this, and I

was very soundly defeated. I think perhaps one other person voted with me against this subcommittee. I feel there are far, far too many committees on this campus at this time. I think most of them are ineffective, and I think there is much better use for our time.

This, as well as a couple of other things which occurred on the senate this year, I think, discouraged me, and caused me to hand in my resignation, which, I suppose, is a somewhat unique thing. I have resigned from the senate effectively as of the first of July. I have allowed myself to be replaced by a proxy for the rest of this year because I just felt that I could use my time much more effectively in other areas to exert my philosophy, rather than to the senate. I think because of some of the investigations the senate has gotten involved in, they have become quite an ineffective body. I would disagree with the fact that some people think they're very effective. I personally don't feel they're very effective, and I might comment on some of these other things later. But this did cause my resignation from the senate.

Anyway, these committees are investigating intercollegiate athletics now, and I do not know what the outcome of this will be. I suppose only time will tell, and, of course, this particular committee only advises the executive board of the senate. Any action, of course, which would come out of there in any way, shape, or form, if it's going to influence the athletic program, of course, it would have to be a Class A action vote, and this type of thing.

Some of the other things which I encouraged—and I see some very good progress on in the athletic area—is the separation of the physical education department and the area of intercollegiate athletics. At this time, of course, they are one and the same. We are in the final stages

of separating the two. It has tentatively been approved by the dean of Arts and Science, as well as the president of this campus, but it is not effective at this time. It would have to be approved by the Board of Regents. A tremendous amount of work has gone into the development of philosophy and all the problems which will be encountered by the separation of the two. And I would hope that by the first of the coming academic year, we will have a separate area of intercollegiate athletics. Hopefully, this will be referred to as the department of intercollegiate athletics, and there will be one administrator for this, and this will be the chairman of intercollegiate athletics, of course, which would be, under our present circumstances, Mr. Dick Trachok, and hopefully—I don't know how far this separation [will] go— but the philosophy is it would be removed from the College of Arts and Science and be made responsible directly to the president. This document has been fairly well approved however, there are still a lot of very important details to be worked out.

One of the important facts that I think will come out of this is the people in here will hold dual assignments. They will both teach as well as coach. But head coaches of these sports will be hired more as lecturers and will not receive appointments as professors. In other words, they would simply be hired as lecturers, which gives you considerable flexibility in salary patterns, but also eliminates tenure. In other words, a head football coach will not receive tenure, and this allows a flexibility one needs to have a successful athletic program. In other words, if we get into a position in the future where we cannot come up with a winning team in an area, and it is necessary, politically, within the state, to make a good showing, we will make a good showing by replacing that individual. And I think in any controversial area, such as athletics, where the entire state

looks at you through your athletic program—like it or not—that this is very, very important. I think this is where we've made, by far and away, our biggest area of progress this year.

As I understand—and I'm not sure of this at this time—but I think that the new basketball coach has been hired under these conditions, [by] which he is not eligible for tenure. I understand he is aware of this fact, and is very much in favor of it. I think most of the head coaches like this flexibility, because it gives them a degree of flexibility in their operations which they don't necessarily have if they are falling under the category of, say, an associate professor or full professor with tenure, and all these other things. They are eligible for all the fringe benefits within the University, as any lecturer is, but their salary can be adjusted according—and I suppose according to the success of the program.

The salary schedule for lecturers doesn't have ceilings on it, either. We have lecturers within the College of Agriculture which are paid very, very little, but on the other hand, as I understand, there are no ceilings, as such. Of course, there're ceilings on it, but not to the point where it's very cut and dried, as an assistant professor's or associate professor's is. Obviously, it's not going to get out of hand, because we're limited financially in many, many areas. But it does offer us a degree of flexibility which we have not had before, and I think it's absolutely essential for the maintenance of a successful program.

Now, do not let me confuse you by the fact that what I'm saying, we're trying to build a Notre Dame of the West, or something like that. Far be it. All we are trying to do is build a successful athletic program within our own resources. And we will compete at a level at which we can be successful. We are not going to go out and schedule major university football teams because we do not

have that financial ability. This is one thing that I think many people miss in athletic programs—say you have a student body of seven thousand, let's say we go to ten thousand (that's a respectable size student body)—we should be able to do it because this number of people can compete with anybody.

Let's see. I'm trying to think of some examples. I think the University of Southern California, of course, which has a very successful football program, has a student body about our own size. Some of the southwestern universities, which have very successful football programs, are much smaller. I think it's either Southern Methodist University or Baylor has an enrollment of two thousand people, or something like this. But money buys your athletic program. It's not the size of your student body. Los Angeles State is one of the Very largest universities in the nation, with an enrollment of maybe 40,000, 50,000 people, in this neighborhood. And yet they do not have a very high-powered athletic program because they haven't placed much emphasis on it. They're in a local area where there is a great demand by students simply to go to school, and they are part of the state college system, and they do not have some of the political problems which we have here in Nevada. And it's very essential that we field representative teams which do a decent job of competing, not necessarily with Notre Dame, but at least with surrounding colleges and universities.

My ultimate goal in this position that I'm in (and, of course, this is contingent [laughing] upon the president's desire to keep me in this position; this is appointed) is that we will—my philosophy is simply that we will—field very representative teams in the area of competition which we are in. In the WCAC—that is, in basketball, which is a major university sport—members of the

WCAC have won the National Collegiate Athletic Association championship on several occasions, and we would hope to be competitive under this type of program. And that simply is that we would like to be amongst the best in the United States.

In football, we would like to be a winner, but it will be at a much reduced level. It will be with smaller universities and state colleges in this area. We are not going to schedule Big Ten teams or pack eight teams routinely. This is not to say we wouldn't occasionally schedule teams such as Washington State, but it would have to be something that we'd look at very carefully. We will probably continue to compete with such universities as, of course, Las Vegas, Santa Clara, state colleges like Cal Poly, Sacramento State, this type of thing—a good, sound football program which is of interest to the state, but one which we can financially afford.

Like I say, I think the Faculty Senate has become somewhat ineffective because they have lost, in my opinion, their goals, in that they have become too involved and oversensitive in protecting the rights of professors. And I think we are too concerned. I think this new organization is aimed at this. I think we're too concerned in our rights as professors. I am a believer of perhaps an old-time philosophy that our rights as professors—whatever these rights are—will be protected by the people we work for, namely the administration and the Board of Regents, provided we are doing an effective job as being professors. When we become so concerned with our rights that we, as a corporate body—that is, the Faculty Senate—have to hire our own lawyer to protect our own rights, and not even be able to trust or rely upon the lawyer which the University currently has working for them to protect our rights, then I think we have serious problems. I don't believe

that our problems are this serious. If they are indeed this serious, then we have some very big problems to overcome. I think we spend far too much time—and I'm speaking about us, the faculty—being concerned with our rights and privileges as professors, including academic freedom. I think that there's a job to be done, and I would simply say to my colleagues, "Let's get on with the job, and not worry so much about our privileges and rights."

Your question is, "What are the goals of higher education?" A very, very broad question. I would label myself as a practical person. I deal with an industry which has been one of the backbones of the state of Nevada, and historically, an industry which has been one of the backbones of this country of ours. And it is an industry. The livestock industry is an industry which has been very, very practical because it's a type of thing that has had to survive with some rather dramatic changes. I deal with these people; I've dealt with them all my life, and I hopefully will deal with them for the rest of my life. I try to, in my mind, take this type of industry and relate it back to what our goals are at the University of Nevada, or any major university. And I think probably this had a lot of influence upon my thinking—back to the athletic program—that I relate back to very practical things. It relates back to, I suppose, who actually controls the University, or what controls do the people have over the University. And actually, a land grant university is designated to serve the people. Basically, this is the way they are set up.

All right, if we are to serve the people, the people should have some say in the government of the University. And it's an amazing thing, but the only say that I can see that the public has in the governing of the University is one which is somewhat

unique, perhaps, by some standards, but is very, very important here and should never be forgotten. The only control that the people have is through—well, there're really two controls, but the only direct control they have is through the legislature and the budget of the University. And I think some of the problems we had two years ago, with some of the—well, the problems we had on this campus, with the unrest, the involvement of professors, one or two in particular, was directly felt in the following budget. And to me, it couldn't've been clearer. Where we did have some—not necessarily cutbacks, but certainly didn't have anticipated increases in budgets, I think this relates right back to the people expressing displeasure with this campus through the legislature. And, of course, we are also governed by the Board of Regents, which is an elected body, but it takes time for them to have as much say into the philosophy of this University.

Now, as far as our goals—I have a number of goals in my own teaching. I have more graduate students in this particular department than the rest of the members put together, and I try to impress upon my graduate students a desire, above all else, to question things in their role after they leave here, whether they go right into work, or into the industry, or whether they go on to obtain a higher degree. I would hope that any graduate student of mine at least leaves here with a very open and a very questioning mind, but a desire to work very hard in his chosen field. And I try to impress the same philosophy on the undergraduates I have in my classes. I work very closely with the undergraduates in agriculture, and I try to impress these things on them, as well as their desire to do a good job in anything they do.

Now, I believe in discipline, and I believe this is one of the goals which we should

create within a university. Even though we are questioning things (we are talking about such things as academic freedom), I try to impress upon my students that they should question. I try to also impress upon them they should question where it is necessary, but not necessarily those things which are not necessary. There has to be a certain degree of discipline. In other words, a student that comes out of here has to be a unique person, perhaps, by some standards. (I'm trying to put this in words which make sense, and it's difficult.) But he has to be a person that will question things, but not forget the fact that he will always be working for somebody, and that there has to be this level of discipline, which I think many of our areas within the University have had a tendency to lose in the last few years. It's—self-discipline, perhaps, would be the correct word. In other words, you can question things, and you indeed should question things, and very definitely question things when it comes to your chosen field, but on the other hand, do not forget the fact that discipline still must exist. In other words, I encourage my own students to question me. On our graduate work, for example, our graduate students, my graduate students, I hope that they question me on everything we do in our research efforts, so that we know what is the best thing. But on the other hand, the students that do work for me—referring again to my graduate students—when a decision is made, the decision for the time being is final until we find a better one. And when I decide to go a certain direction, even though we have listened to pros and cons and considered all aspects which we are capable of considering, when a decision is made, then we will abide by that decision. It's a combination of the open mind and questioning, but yet, do not forget the fact that discipline is very, very important.

I think that this should be one of the goals of the University, and I think that many times in the last four or five years, because of the unrest of students and the unrest of faculty, we have tended to forget about discipline. I think this has led to some of the problems we've had—fortunately, not too serious on this campus—but very serious on some campuses, and I would say very serious with universities in general, that discipline has, for the most part, taken a very back seat. In fact, we find many, many people on campuses across the United States and in very important positions as professors, or even division chairmen, this type of thing, advocating not open rebellion, but certainly open resentment against the Establishment, if you will. I would agree that the Establishment has to continually be questioned. I question it every day of the week, myself. But I hope that we can always do it in a respectful manner, because when that is over and done with, that will be the best way.

The open demonstrations, almost openly-preached violence, in some cases, in my mind, is the most distasteful thing that we can become involved in, and I am against this approach under any and all circumstances. But I like to be able to create a balance within my students, anyway, of a questioning mind, but never to forget the discipline which is necessary to still get the job done. And I feel that this thing has fallen down very badly within our own University, and even within our own college here, within the College of Agriculture.

I think, probably, we initiated teacher-course evaluation in the College of Agriculture before anybody else on this campus. We've had it for several years, and it has been an extremely useful tool. I use it myself. I have always used it. We have a regular form which has been used within the college,

and variations of this form are now used elsewhere, and, of course, there is a standard University form.

I have found that it has helped me in various areas, because I like to pride myself as a good instructor. I find that a limited sampling of these evaluation forms is somewhat meaningless, but if you have a large enough class, or, say, two years or two semesters of classes where the same point tends to show up, then you become fairly aware— or, if you have an open mind, you certainly become fairly aware that you do have some weaknesses— and you tend to overcome these. Teacher-evaluation forms have shown me some very definite weaknesses I had as an instructor, and I certainly was not aware of, and I attempted to change these. Now, during the last year, I have not taught very many classes because I have been on primarily extension assignment. Hopefully, if I do continue to teach, I would see improvement in these areas, and I would measure it by my student evaluations, not only my own teaching effectiveness, but in my course material. So I think that the student evaluation of teachers—of the teacher as well as the course material—is one of the real good things which I've seen develop in the last two or three years.

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS CLUB

ABBAS ALI LAKHANI, PRESIDENT

Abbas Au Lakhani: I'm Abbas Au Lakhani. I'm a student from Pakistan, and I'm a grad student. I'm doing my master's in metallurgical engineering. I changed my studies from Stanford to this campus. Previously, I was at Stanford. I got some funds for research here, so I changed my education from Stanford to this campus. And this campus is as well known in my field as any other branches.

Last year was my first year here, and there have been so many events that I have to recollect, but one of the most famous events was this Black students' confrontation with the student union. I think the Black students were legitimate in having a confrontation, but the way the events took shape was not desirable, so to say. After all, the organizations on the campus should have some place to work, and the Black Students' Union is one of those which does not have any available space or office to work or to carry out their usual day-to-day work.

The Black students' community has had to face so many problems all over the U. S. A., and in the last six or seven years, it was

realized that they have to take some initial steps to attain these. And this was a good realization. But the thing is, occupation of office, and after the president's warning (President N. Edd Miller's warning), they should have at least taken into consideration the president's word of honor, and should have negotiated it with him. But I don't know what they (Black students) had in their mind, but the events were not as good as they should have been. But, even now, they face the same problem, and nothing has yet been done, even after this confrontation. And I don't know when this issue is going to be resolved.

Like the Black Students' Union, this International Club has also the same problem, of having any space where they can hold the meetings, which they can call their own area. In some of the big campuses all over the U. S. A., you will find international houses, specifically international clubs, with their own buildings. But it is very unfortunate to see this, that we don't have even a room here. And this problem we are going to bring to the notice of higher authorities of the University.

We brought this to the notice of our foreign students' advisor, and he explained the problems on this campus, of building shortage for such things. But he has promised that when the Jot Travis Lounge of the Students' Union building is going to be expanded, we'll surely have some space of our own. So I am hopeful for that.

Ruth G. Hilts: Yes. I want to ask you something that one of the alumni people mentioned. He said, "Don't the students from other lands feel like part of the student body? Why do they want to be separate?" Do you want to talk about that?

Yeah. You know, we come from different cultures. We come from different lands. We have different languages. We have different ways of living. We have different hopes, aspirations, and attitudes. Now, although we are part and parcel of this University—in fact, we are, so to say, an individual entity in itself. We have a distinct color of our own. And however we would like to change, or we may be, so to say, colored by the culture of America, but still, we'll have our own distinct features, characters, which we cannot change. And for that, we must have a small group of our own where we can meet together and get together.

Some of the problems I would like to narrate in this respect, that a foreign student has to go through when he comes to an American university.

A foreign student, when he comes, he has to adjust to the climate at first, because most of us come from very humid and very warm climates, and it is a real unusually cold climate over here. Secondly, the food habits. Our food habits are altogether different than that of the Americans. Say, personally, myself—I eat very hot dishes. And when I was in the Nye Hall, putting up for one semester there,

I had a real problem of adjusting myself to the food in the dining commons. Time and again, I had to, so to say, skip my meals, sometimes, because I could not eat what was available there. Moreover, being a Moslem in religion, I am not supposed to take pork, and wine, and products of those things. And some of the American friends, they just don't understand that. This is one of the bindings of my religion. They think that since they are able to eat anything and drink anything, they say, "Why not? You—?"

But what I consider is, people coming from the East, they have more of a bounden responsibility or feelings toward their religion. They are, so to say, well linked with their religion, show more affiliation towards religion than what I consider American students on this campus do, because I find American students a little removed from religion. I'm not passing a moral judgment. But this is what I feel, that the American students are not so much close to their religion as some of us coming from the foreign areas.

Now, thirdly, we have to adjust to the condition of currency. See, one dollar in my currency costs eleven rupees. Wow, when I spend a dollar, I consider I am spending almost eleven rupees back home. Secondly, the earnings here are high. The wages here are high. But the wages back home are hardly one sixth or one eighth of what an American gets. So I also multiply my spendings eight times. In that way, when an American thinks of spending a dollar as a single dollar, I am thinking as if I am spending eighty rupees, or eighty bucks back home. So we try to always regulate or minimize our expenses as far as possible. And in this respect, for instance, here, on this campus, we face a problem of being classified as nonresidents; and being classified nonresidents, we have to pay six hundred

dollars' additional nonresident tuition fees. And six hundred dollars multiplied by twenty times, at least, means how much money. You can understand it. Believe it or not, that one semester of my education here, which costs about \$850 or so, is equal to ten years of my high school education back home. do not have to spend even that much. While our earnings have remained the same, cost of education has multiplied nearly eighty-fold. I earnestly hope that in times ahead, the out-of-state tuition fee will be removed for foreign students.

Secondly, we don't have a chance to earn anything here. We have a problem of, say, after learning, what? We'll be spending about four or five thousand dollars per year for education here. And what results [do] we have? We can't go to work, and there is a lot of discrimination against foreign students getting a job.

Do you want to work here, or do you want to go home to Pakistan?

I would like to go back to Pakistan. But, the amount of money I have spent here, I would like to take out some of it, at least. Because the amount of money I have spent here, it will take at least two years to collect it back home. But it will take hardly six months or eight months to get it back here. So what I have spent here, I would like to earn it back, because what I have got is support from my family, and it is my moral obligation to pay them back. So my family's supporting me, and in due course, I'll have to support them.

One thing which the Americans also don't understand about a foreign student is that, "How come you are being supported by your family?" That is the usual thing back home, that the children are educated up to the highest level, by their parents, or by their families, and in turn, as the parents grow old,

the children, educated children, they support the families. We don't have a Social Security system. The children are the best social securities.

Then coming to one of the problems of President N. Edd Miller's resignation. Now, I think that all those were really odd incidents, in the sense that, after all, a president has some problems of his own, and he has to undergo stresses and strains. And anybody who's ruling in office would not like to have an odd remark passed against him, although he's doing a nice job. He has run up the name of the University, as well. The University is being recognized as a good institution. And in this respect, if somebody were to put a small, bad remark against the President, he would not like to see those things. So those people who castigated him or put a bad remark were not doing justice to the services he has given.

Now, one thing—the most amazing thing is that regarding the ASUN constitution. I'm still amazed that, even coming from a small college back home, we have a constitution for the running of our student union. And I was coming front a second batch of graduates of that college. And we had a constitution of our own. We formulated it, we passed it, and we got it approved from the higher authorities. But it is most amazing that this school, which is running for the last about hundred years, has problems to frame one which is acceptable to all students.

Now, let me assume a relation. A constitution is a working instrument, and if it has been there, what you need is an amendment to the constitution, not a change of constitution. So when you want to amend, you can amend any constitution. No constitution is the final word, like the word of God. So you have to change it from time to time, as the demands come. As the

circumstances change, you have to change the constitution.

Did the students in your group read the new proposal and vote on it one way or another, or did it interest them deeply?

Well, one thing what I'd like to comment here regarding this constitution, that this is a constitution for the undergrads. And one thing more: Why is this organization for undergrads different from grads? Why not have one organization which is followed and which has the backing of all the students studying on this campus? All the students come under the same category. After all, they are the students of the University of Nevada.

Now, we have the yearbook, in which you would be amazed—if you were to send it to some foreign country, some school abroad, or to somebody who does not know about the University of Nevada, they'll think that this is only a[n] undergrad school. There's not a single reference in the whole book about graduate students or their activities. And the graduate student body does not bring out any separate book. Or it does not have a small section of its own, in the yearbook. That's quite amazing. One of my brothers is studying at American University, Beirut. Now, in that university, they have a fine book, yearbook, which shows whatever the students—whether they are undergrads or grads, they are shown with their own pictures and their names, and what year they are going to graduate. And the yearbook not only should be just a pictorial one. It should have some information, some stories, or some creative, artistic things of the students, or literature created by the students. The yearbook should carry a picture of all the office bearers and members of different student organizations, including the International Club.

But we cannot say anything about the ASUN constitution, being graduate students, so I would not like to put a remark about this, except that it is very pathological, so to say, a pity of the students, that in one whole year, they have not been able to reach a decision about change or amendments to the constitution. And if they could not reach the decision in one year, how can these people, while they will be dealing with problems in their day-to-day life, solve them when they'll be entering their practical life? How will they be able to take decisions if they cannot take a decision on a small matter? You have to accommodate yourself. Everybody will not like everything, but there can be give and take.

[The university is a training ground for life], so they must learn to make decisions. And this was the best time, since, having a position in office, they should have done this. They did not avail [themselves] of this chance, which they have missed, and they have missed forever. And if they had adopted, then they would have gone down in the history of the University as those who changed the constitution. And this constitution would have gone for years to come. But they missed it. They missed it.

Dan Klaich, the president of the ASUN, said, "Maybe we just didn't present it the right way. Not enough students knew what we were trying to do." Do you feel that that's true?

One thing is lack of communication between the ASUN and the student body, because, you know, we have a newspaper of our own, a biweekly Sagebrush, and he could have brought all those things into the print, and it wasn't done. Not much of the pains were taken. Everybody thought that, "If they do it, it's okay; if they don't do it, that's okay." There was no taking of real interest in that.

I think this is a nice proposition, to do away with the out-of-state tuition fees. In this age, in America, especially, there is so much of a mobility, of students coming from one area to the other, and it is their right to adopt any area to the other, and it is their right to adopt any area as their area. After all, they are citizens of this nation, not a state. And they have a right to get an education in any school of their choice. And why put a penalty on them? If they are willing to adopt this school as their alma mater, why should they be penalized? If they think this city's much better, calm (this campus is free from troubles of student strikes, and those things), and pollution-free, then you are taxing out-of-state students on the liking of the school?

Would it not be better to remove the distinctions? Would not this be better, to remove the distinction that, "You are coming from that state, you are not from this state." This is creating a partialism, or sectionalism or regionalism. This fact has caused a havoc back home, that we had to part with one part of Pakistan because of these regional feelings. I do not wish to see the same problems in this state, or in this country.

But these are not small things. But as time progresses, you are making a person feel that [if] you are still not a citizen of this state, or not a resident of the state, you have no right to educate yourself equally. You say you have equal opportunities. That is not—that is totally against the equal opportunities.

So every state should have just one tuition for everybody?

Yeah. For everybody. And since—I recall especially about the foreign students, they are coming all the way, five thousand or more miles away from their homes, coming to educate themselves. They are representatives

of their country. And what they are going to learn, they are going to carry this education back home, and spread [it] in due course. They'll go in the field of education, or whether they go in the field of industry, or business, they are going to carry the banner of the University of Nevada. And they are being taxed for carrying this—. See, foreign students, previously, in the state of California, were being treated as equal to the resident students, California students.

Don't they have out-of-state tuition?

Previously, it did not. Nowadays, they have also started it. Last quarter or so, they raised the fees by two hundred dollars for out-of-state students, and in that category also come the foreign students, in the California area. But they have filed suit, that, how can they raise the fees? Because they have a limited means.

When I came here, I was paying four hundred dollars out-of-state. Then they raised it to six hundred dollars. Now, that is a jump of two hundred dollars. That may be a small amount for an American student, but for the foreign student, consider it to be at least twenty times. So it's equal to four thousand rupees back home, a jump of twenty times, which, because of the limited funds at our disposal, we cannot afford it.

What attracts students from your area, or from any foreign country, to the University of Nevada?

One thing is this. It is a very peaceful area here. Quality of education is good, and especially our School of Mines is very notably known. And not only that, in due course, they think that this area gives a chance of having at least a summer job, to earn something, that

other areas do not. They can do some summer job and earn a way.

Regarding job hunting after graduation, the thing is this: when we go out, we apply for a job, they say we can go for eighteen months' training, on a training visa. Now, a company which hires us would not like—or does not wish to hire us for a small period. They say it will take about three to six months to train you up, and the benefits we'll be able to reap for a year or so. And then you'll have to go back. But they don't understand that those students who are coming here, coming abroad for education, they must have some—they must take some practical experience so that when they go back home, they are more £ it. Education is not the only end. They must have some practical experience. And after coming to the U. S. A., if the opportunities for practical experience are, so to say, not given to them, it's just sheer bad luck of the students, and inconsistency of the educational system.

Do you know these conditions before you come to the United States?

No, we don't. No, we don't know.

But the thing is—you know, after all, thinking of a prosperous United States, compared to all the developing countries, you cannot imagine, also, that you will not be able to gain a small job. Just for a short period, not even for a long period.

And some companies are willing to hire us, but the precondition is that we must have a, so to say, green card—that is, a resident visa. Now, if we seek a resident visa, then we are also denying our affiliation with our country, that we are thinking of settling down here. That means the "brain drain" from developing countries.

Now, if we don't, we are not able to get a job. When you apply to a company for a job

after your education is completed, they say, "You must have this resident visa." Now, when you go to apply for this resident visa, they say you must have a job. So this is a vicious circle which has to be broken somehow or another—I don't know when and how. But this has to be broken.

The foreign students who are coming here, they also have some feelings. And they must gain some practical experience. Theory is good, education is good. But education combined with experience will be more beneficial to the developing countries than mere education. Some of the foreign students in the past, because of the lenient attitude of the immigration authorities to grant them a resident visa or immigration visa, they used to stick around. And they just would not like to go back home. But it's changing now. They have to think now that they have to go back home. This is a good thing, although some restrictions have been imposed on us. But this is good.

But by bringing this law, that a foreign student will not be given the resident visa unless and until the place where he's employed (or the employer) thinks that he cannot be replaced by some American. So this way, this brain drain can be regulated, to a certain extent, at least. But still, there are some loopholes which I would not like to discuss. Some of us do not care for resident visas, but we do need a chance to acquire practical training.

About the International Club, I would like to discuss this now. See, we have over forty countries being represented on this campus, and there are about—last semester, there were a hundred and twelve foreign students on this campus. They come from some of the countries—Mexico, to start, your next door neighbor; then Canada; some from Britain; some from Europe; some all the way from

Africa; some from the Middle East; some from India and Pakistan; and some from Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Japan. But large groups, which basically are two main groups—one is India and Pakistan students, and one is Chinese students, Taiwanese students—these are the two big groups coming from those areas.

How do all of these students relate to each other within your organization?

You know, although there are some splinter groups, as well, like India and Pakistan student association. Having the problems of registration and those—they work within the International Club. But as a small group entirely within the organization, they are a different entity, so to say. And there is a Chinese students' association. Now, recently there has been formed an Asian-American Alliance.

The thing is the members of our group are also the members of their groups, so—because this is a free country, you can affiliate yourself with any group. I think one thing being common of all the foreign students, since they are foreigners, they like to group themselves. They feel more comfortable in the company of a foreigner than of an American.

One thing I'd like on this campus, like I had with students of Stanford—there should be a reception committee to receive the foreign students. We do not have any. But we should—at least, there should be somebody from the University, or the student body, or our group, or any of these groups together, they should form a small reception committee for foreign students, all other students, new students, who are coming on this campus.

Now, on the Stanford campus, we have a, so to say, get-together of the community living in and around campus and the foreign

students once every quarter or so, or whenever there's a large number of students coming in, so there is more of familiarization.

There should be also a community program, a host family program here, which we are not having here. Host family program. Foreign students coming from foreign countries, they are separated from their families, but if they can be given the same conditions, or the same liking or atmosphere of home, being affiliated with an American family as a host, for a foreign student, they would likely feel more comfortable. They would like to learn something about the American way of life and home.

Now, I was a host family member of a Palo Alto area family at Stanford. Even now, whenever they have Easter or Christmas, or other occasions, they invite me. By that way, we can share your happiness's, or your holidays and those programs of festivities, and they can also join in our programs, or our festivities.

Has your club, the International Students' Club, suggested publicly that this would be a good thing for our community?

Yeah. We are working on this program. I was told that there was a program a few years back, but due to lack of interest of our organization, and also, the community of Reno, this program has bogged down. But we are going to make a try again for the next semester.

We are intending to hold an international dinner, where we can call the local community to participate, as well as those teachers on this campus. They can participate, as well as our American friends.

Do you students find a welcome at the Center?

Yeah. The Center for Religion [and Life] is the only place which has been giving us a lot of help to organize our programs. And I'm really thankful that they do, because we don't have any other place to go about,

Regarding the teacher-course evaluation—I think that there are some teachers on this campus (I would not like to mention the names, in specific) who are a bit critical of the foreign students. And they are a bit prejudiced about the foreign students. I think this is not fair. Since they [foreign students] are part and parcel of this University student body, why they should be discriminated [against], or why they should have a feeling that American students are more superior than foreign students. I think this problem needs an in-depth study by the teachers' evaluation committee.

Do you find this true in your science classes, or in your general academic classes, or in your field?

In my academic field. I feel there are some people who just like to behave in a typical un-American-like manner, which hurts us a lot, to see that their attitude is altogether unfavorable to a foreign country resident, or a student.

Now, one thing more regarding the credits for graduation—increasing the credits for graduation. I don't think, in this age, when students are getting matured at an early age, lengthening the course work is advisable. You may have also come across the Carnegie Commission's report that they should reduce the period of education from four years to three and a half years, or even three years, whereas we are going for more and more, increasing the credits. But that's an antiparadox, so to say. The trend of the country is going in one direction, and the

trend of our college is going in the right opposite direction. And this is not only a problem of this school, but is a problem which is being evaluated all over the world, back home, also. We had four and a half years of a university school, then we reduced it to four, but some places, it has gone from four to five years. But they have decreased one year in the high school level. Instead of twelve classes, they have made it eleven classes, and five years of college level education. By that way, if the people in the educational field feel that their education is not getting a due share of time, they should, instead of twelve classes for high school, go for eleven classes and five years of university level school. But this really should be reduced, not increased, because what I feel is the younger generation is coming up with so many new things going on all around in his environment that they become more mature, I think, at a lower age than their fathers or their forefathers.

And also, one thing—if they have to cut down the amount of time for education in their field, from four years to three years, some of the outworn courses should be reduced, and more emphasis should be put on professionalization.

Regarding this ROTC, I have no comment because I am not close with this. I am exempt from this. But still, what I feel—or, what some of my American friends feel, that ROTC is a burden on them. They feel that if the American way of life says that it is a free enterprise, free democracy, what you like, why should they be forced to this ROTC? And this has been the trend of the revolutionary type of students, that the university should be an academia. It should not be—it should be free from all influences other than academic things. And they feel that military training is beyond the scope of a university. They feel that if that has to be done, it has to be done

in Marine schools, in military colleges, where they should be given compulsory training for a period of six months or a year. Why should they be bothered of this during their education?

They feel that this is beyond the scope of a university's sphere of influence of education.

One thing before I discuss other problems is, I would like to discuss about some fine activities on this campus. One is the Mackay Day. I think that is one day when I think—. There are some activities on this campus, but I find this is a campus free from activities.

What about Library Day yesterday? Were you here?

Yeah. It was a nice occasion on that day, and it was very unusual, so to say. But we had such a nice band going on.

Tell me about Mackay Day.

It was a very enjoyable day, I should say. But we had all the nice things going on—parachute jumping, throwing of the people in the lake, then there was the raft competition, then dressing up in the Western dress. And I think the girls are more suitable in that dress than in this present-day dress. They look more charming in that dress. Then, also, we had the governor coming on that day, on the Governor's Day. But last year when he came on the Governor's Day, we had a luncheon, so to say, open air, in the Quad. It was a nice thing.

There should be a link between the government and the students. But I think even the governor was confined—a bit more confined to the group who were surrounding him. There should have been more intermingling between the governor and the students.

Did you go up and say, "Hi, Mr. O'Callaghan, it's nice to?"

No, because he was being surrounded by all the big shots. There should be more intermingling of the people— of the governor and the students. Like recently, just two, three days back, Governor Reagan talked from UCLA through a satellite system to all the UC campuses. And there was a back link between the students and the governor, audiovisual link.

I think it is nice to have the activities, like the jazz band's programs, and Ravishankar's concert, et cetera. Ravishankar, he was the Indian musician. His concert and such programs really are bringing two cultures to meet. One was from the West, one from the East.

Now, I think there is a shortage of space in the restaurant section [of the] cafeteria. The cafeteria needs to be expanded, by and large. In the afternoons, there are no spaces for students who go for buying their lunches. The Cost of lunch has also been increased tremendously, which I think is very unfair. Because five cents apiece on a ten cent glass of cold drink, a rise of five cents on ten cents, that is fifty percent. And five cents on twenty cents of French fries, five cents' raise on hamburgers—these are the usual things which students eat. There is a raise of fifteen cents on an amount of seventy cents. That's a considerable amount. I don't think that the cost of living has gone 80 high. It's a very arbitrary thing. But their thing is they have raised the prices of the salaries of some of the big bosses, and they are taxing the students. Why should the students be taxed for paying the salary of the big man?

Well, who do you mean by the "big man?"

The food and cafeteria supervisors who run the cafeteria.

Why should the students pay for increasing the salaries of the people who work in the dining commons, or the losses in the dining commons? Why should they be taken off from the students who are paying cash? Why should the regular students, who are eating whatever they like, they be taxed for the losses to be incurred in the dining commons? If the dining commons is not able to finance itself, then, better close it up. Whether people who run it like it or not, it's their problem.

Regarding the status of higher education on this campus, I think more and more students, especially coming from Nevada, are now going for higher education beyond the undergrad level. And this is a good sign, that people are getting more aware of higher education. And one thing which may have caused this realization is also the higher unemployment rates in and around this city, especially.

Regarding the aims and goals of higher education in Nevada, the aim should be to spread more educated people in and around the state, in all sections of the state. I find—and it's most amazing to find—that even in this state's legislature and the senate, there are some senators and legislators who are not well educated. HOW can this state progress? The attitude of this state towards education has not been what other states are putting up, say, in the case of Massachusetts or California. Massachusetts is one of those states which has the top priority for education. And why this attitude of cutting the budget by the legislature for the University? Because they don't have much of educated people. Because they don't have any realization that they are going to educate this state and the younger generation.

And say, like Stanford University's top echelons started a campaign to raise \$500,000,000 in five years. They started this

campaign recently, to raise \$500,000,000 in five years. Now, we cannot raise that much, but still, if all office bearers of this university were to go into the public to make them realize the necessity of education and research, attaining of higher goals through education, I think they can gain quite a bit of support. But this has never been explored.

Our own officeholders have never explored this field, I think, to go into the masses to gain something, to go to industries in this area to get something. You can go all over the state, or all over the U. S. A. Some of the students or alumni of this campus may be in big positions. They may be able to contribute something. But presently, how much is their contribution? Just a negligible amount.

The alumni this year were able to raise \$45,000.

Yeah, but that's a negligible amount, compared to the services this campus has given to the state in the last hundred years.

Moreover, I think, if we have to improve the education in this state, there should be wider utilization of the libraries. I find the libraries are not-being so much used as it should have been. And if we have to improve, or give a sense of direction to the masses, there should be more utilization of the libraries. And not only that, we must improve the condition of all libraries. The libraries are the storehouse of knowledge. And if they remain unutilized, they are just giving the books away to the ants to eat off.

Yeah. Where did you get your great love of libraries and your feeling that it's the storehouse of knowledge? Is this something that's instilled in Pakistani students in your colleges?

No, because I have been attached with the community. I come from an Ismaili

community, belong to an Ismaili community of the Moslem religious sect. The leaders in the past of our community were the establishers of the first university of Al-Azhar. The first university of the world. Al-Azhar, Cairo, Egypt.

And you are, yourself, from Pakistan?

This is the first university of the world known to the present age. And it still exists. It's over a thousand years old, and it still exists. And in our community, there is a library system working on a voluntary basis. And attached with all the areas where there is a concentration of people, attached with each mosque, there is a library. So our mosques are not just a place for prayer, but also gathering for the group, and also deploy different services attached with our mosques, which we call Jamaat khana. We have libraries and other social institutions, like Scouts clubs, Scout groups, Girl Guides groups, free employment agencies, and we have other community organizations—all the facilities attached with the mosque.

Attached with this, we have all the facilities. And some of the big libraries of the Middle East were built by some of the religious leaders in the past. And even the Spanish Moorish Spain, this also is a past history of our ancestors, so to say. And in that, also, you'll find there are fine libraries there, attached with it.

This is why you have this strong feeling for the library, and the meaning of it. Our director would love you.

I have been fighting with him (Mr. Morehouse) for better newspapers, magazines, and books to be added in the library.

You know, one facility which I would like in this library is to have some international

newspapers, which are not being provided. Now, he (Mr. Morehouse) demands about finances. He's legitimate in that. But you have to give something—a piece of action to the international community, as well. And one complaint I have against this library is, there should be more foreign newspapers available in this University library. There should be more foreign magazines available. The newspapers and the magazines which come in this library should be coming at the proper time. They come quite a bit late. The Nevada State Journal, which comes out early in the morning, is available in the Library in the afternoon, or in the evening. The Reno Evening Gazette, which comes out in the afternoon, is available the next day morning. The San Francisco Chronicle, which comes out today, will be available tomorrow morning. What is the fun in having a newspaper—if you call it a newspaper—having a stale newspaper?

The reason our librarian gives is that it is for research. But the newspaper is not a part and parcel of research only. It has to give news, and fresh news, to the students. The fresh news should be given to the students, those students who are interested. Why should they come to the library to read a newspaper on this very campus, if it is sold in the store, or in the, so to say, racks, for fifteen cents, but is available fresh, but the same thing is not available on this campus library?

They say that (research is] the basic purpose. But I think that is not the basic purpose, especially some foreign students. They cannot afford to buy a newspaper every day, but they would like to go in and snoop around, and just have a look at what's new.

Now, one problem—this problem was highly emphasized, because during the Indo-Pakistan war, now, we did not have any answers with what's going on back home,

except the news media, or the television. But we could have easily, if we had an easy access to some of the newspapers, which could give us what's going on back home day to day. It could have eliminated some of our problems.

The library needs to give information, news, and views, as well as giving literature. Now, if it lacks in giving news on the spot, if it is giving us stale news, what is the use of a library, going to the library for the news? Then you are curtailing the services of the library.

And one complaint I have, also—I don't know what's the reason—there are some books available in the library which are only one piece, only one copy. Now, some of the students, when they have to go to refer, those books are not available.

It's lack of money, but the students are getting taxed. Because if they have to submit a paper in two days, or three days, or they have to give a tutorial or an assignment in twenty-four hours, if they don't find some of these books, they—. So they can't do it.

Concerning the problem of the improvement of the library, I think, since the funds from the legislature and the senate are not coming up as they should to improve the library, I think the students would be willing to share this burden by paying a couple of dollars every semester, or four or five dollars a semester. That would not be too much of an asking, because they are aware of the service of the library. But if that money could be properly utilized to improve the number of books, the type of books, and the different sources of books, then, I think the student body as well as the student union will support this idea of having a small tax on the students of four or five dollars every semester to improve the libraries. And this money, say, with a student body of 6,000, five dollars comes to about \$30,000. And \$30,000 is not a small amount.

So you speak for yourself, or for all students?

I think most of the students will be willing to give this amount if they are assured that what they are going to pay is going to be utilized only for that purpose, to improve the book stock. They would be willing to share this expense.

In comparison with other schools in this U. S., I think what we lack is a good number of profs in some of the schools. We need a little bit more bigger faculty than what it is. And for this, again, we will have the problem of finances. I don't know how they are going to solve this. But we need a larger faculty.

The thing is if we have a larger faculty, we can attract a larger student community. Because of lack of faculty, sometimes we don't get a good student community, or a large enough group of students. As our societies change, our students express greater needs and expectations.

Regarding the quality of education improving or decreasing, I think the quality of education is improving. But still, yet, some more things are expected, such as improvement in the labs, in the laboratories, improvement in the—

You're thinking of physical facilities, then?

—Yeah, but the quality of education is also based upon these. Especially if you are coming from an engineering or a science field, these are part and parcel of it. Some innovative ideas of the students need to be supported beyond the capacity of those departments, like the idea of the mechanical engineering department, of the innovative idea of having a car based on nitrogen as fuel.

What I find, from my talks with the students in those departments, is that they

are lacking funds. They just don't have any support at all from the research funds, or from the University, or anything. They are putting out money in small bits through their own pocket expenses. And then they have a fantastic idea, but that is getting rusty, or will be exploited much more faster by some other people, if their idea were to begin with somebody else. Because of lack of support, financial support, from our University for this innovative idea, they are not getting anywhere ahead. They can do marvels in this. They can solve this problem of pollution.

Now, there is also the idea of having a crushproof body on the car. Now, this is also a nice idea, which can solve some of our problems of accidents, or the deaths in the accidents. But they lack financial support. And it is very unpleasant to note that the University and the authorities who know this are not taking any measures to exploit this idea, or to improve this idea, or helping them in improving this, or bringing up in practical shape this idea.

I think, I wish, and I hope that our University should also accept the changing style of curriculum which other universities of repute are nowadays practicing. One of my suggestions is that we must make it an option of the student going for a master's degree to make his own choice to do it with a thesis or without a thesis. The choice should be entirely of the student. Moreover, at the master's level, we must do away with comprehensive exams for no thesis students. Similar measures are already being practiced by Stanford and UC Berkeley. Can't we follow in the footsteps of reputed schools to improve our standards?

Education should be for the sake of education, and it should not lose its meaning by unliberal regulations. There should also be some courses which may bring out nothing but some innovative ideas or models.

Innovation is necessary for progress of science and mankind.

Concluding, I will say that the University is good as a small university, but a small university should not end in small thoughts. It should have higher thoughts, wider areas, higher goals to aim for. And the community's response to keep it small is very against the nature of an expanding university, of the concept of education. The concept of education deals with expansion and with amelioration of the problems, making people realize that these are the hard facts of life, that universities should expand their services as far as possible, as best as possible. And if the response from the community and the state is not forthcoming in the manner what it should be, the University may have to be phased out and may go down, decaying. And in this respect, I hope, I feel, I aspire, that someday, people of this state may think that the University is the number one problem, or the number one task which needs improvement, and which needs their assistance.

ORIGINAL INDEX: FOR REFERENCE ONLY

In order to standardize the design of all UNOHP transcripts for the online database, they have been reformatted, a process that was completed in early 2012. This document may therefore differ in appearance and pagination from earlier printed versions. Rather than compile entirely new indexes for each volume, the UNOHP has made each transcript fully searchable electronically. If a previous version of this volume existed, its original index has been appended to this document for reference only. A link to the entire catalog can be found online at <http://oralhistory.unr.edu/>.

A

- Academic Council, 292, 309
 Academic Standards Committee, 90, 92, 93, 98-102, 331
 Activities Board, 60, 61, 159, 164, 165
 Adamian, Paul, 43, 115, 188, 189, 203, 265, 266, 274, 275
 Affirmative Action Statement [Human Relations], 32-34, 42
 Affirmative Action Statement [Status of Women], 291-292
 AFL-CIO, 347
 Aggies, 73, 74
 Aiken, Jim, 287
 Aizely, Paul, 312
 Al-Azhar, Cairo, Egypt, 410
 Albright, Laurie, 139
 Almo, Robert, 69-70
 Alumni Association, 1, 38-39, 210-211, 289, 358
 Alumni Giving Program, 1, 2
 American Association of University Professors, 9-12, 14-20, 204, 310, 319, 348
 American College of Life Underwriters (Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania), 230
American History, the Black Experience, 151, 152-154
 American Indian students, 41, 63, 110-111, 120, 150, 192, 250
 American Medical Association, 213
 Anderson, Dr. Fred M., 214, 354, 357
 Anderson, James T., 71
 Anderson, Kevin, 143
 Anglo-Saxons, 28, 193
 Armstrong, Charles, 348
Artemisia, 164, 171
 Asian-American Alliance, 25, 27, 36-38, 400
 Asian students, 25, 27, 28-31, 35-38, 41, 43, 110, 120, 150, 192, 400
 Asian studies, 27-28, 34
 Associated Governing Boards, 222
 Associated Students of the University of Nevada [ASUN], 35, 44-45, 50, 76, 83-84, 97, 99, 102, 108, 115, 123, 125, 134-138, 139, 151, 158, 165-169, 171-172, 179, 185, 250, 341
 Associated Students, University of Nevada, Constitution, 40-41, 58-64, 89, 94-96, 117-122, 163-165, 187, 220, 392, 393-394
 Associated Students, University of Nevada, Judicial Council, 86, 87-89, 94, 135, 200
 Associated Students, University of Nevada, Senate, 62-63, 73-74, 86, 99, 108, 118-119, 121, 135, 165, 169, 250, 292
 Associated Women Students, 172

Athletics See: Black
athletes; Intercollegiate
athletics; Women's ath-
letics
Autobiography of Malcolm X,
152

B

Backman, Lori, 289
Barmettler, Edmund R.,
204-206, 316
Barnes, Roberta, 71, 142,
289
Barrett, Howard E., 352,
358
Barrett, Tex, 68-69
Basta, Samuel W., 249, 356
Batjer, Chris, 289
Bell, Joe, 59
Bell, Tom, 247, 267, 279
Bible, Paul, 206, 346
Big Sky Conference, 363
Bilbray, James, 354
Black athletes, 40, 111-
113, 185-186, 188, 300,
337-339, 365-366
Black students, 2, 31, 40,
41, 43, 63, 73-77, 88-
89, 109-110, 111-113,
115, 116, 120, 150, 176,
177, 179, 180, 189, 191-
193, 250-254, 336, 340-
342, 386-387
Black Student Union, 26,
73, 108, 122, 156, 158,
175-186, 186a, 187, 190-
191, 194, 195, 196, 198-
200, 201, 211, 250, 253,
386
Black Student Union "sit-
in," 5-6, 26, 40, 65-75,
86, 89, 108-109, 116,
156, 175-185, 211, 249-
253, 300, 336, 365, 386
Bohmont, Dale W., 325
Boosters Club See: Wolf-
pack Boosters Associa-
tion

Boyd, Alex, 184, 260, 345
Brown, Mildred, 289
Burrell, Otis, 184

C

Carnegie Commission on
Higher Education, 222,
226, 403
Carpenter, Kenneth J., 40,
260, 336
Carson City, Nevada, 39,
173, 217
Carson City Community Col-
lege, 216, 217, 218
Cary, Quentin, 199
Cattelain, Ann, 260, 345
Center for Religion and
Life, 35, 151, 179, 246,
247-249, 250, 356, 402
Chicano See: Mexican-
American
Child care center, 95, 162-
163, 172, 290-291
Chinese language courses,
237-238
Chinese-American students,
25, 31, 36-38, 39, 63
See also: Asian stu-
dents
Clark, Walter Van Tilburg,
355
Clarke, Jack, 56
Cleveland Browns (football
team), 286
College of Engineering,
131
"College without walls"
(concept), 230-231, 297-
298
Columbia University, 331,
332
Columbian press, 359
Commission on the Status
of Women, 13, 161, 289-
292, 293-294
Community College System,
203, 215-218, 228, 229,
243, 330

Community relations, 1-2,
3, 142, 159, 166, 183,
333, 401-402
Community Relations semi-
nars, 249
Coray, Michael, 154, 155
"Cowboys," 57, 352

D

Davis, Emerson S. "Stan,"
5, 6, 65, 71-72, 73, 87,
89, 175, 200, 211
Dawson, Ted, 343
Depression, 347, 351
Desert Research Institute,
203, 334-335
Dewey system, 103
Division Hearing Committee,
86
Dodson, Edwin, 261
Donehower, Grace M., 290
Donnelly, Charles, 203,
217
Dormitories, 139-147, 229-
230
Drake, St. Clair, 152, 153
Drug (cases), 87-88

E

Economic Opportunity Pro-
gram, 35, 72, 99, 101
Edsall, Gen. Floyd, 54
Eisenhower Commission on
Higher Education, 18
Elko, Nevada, 2, 243, 245
Elko Community College,
216
Elmore, Richard "Rick,"
95, 108, 169, 241
Ethnic Coalition, 41
Ethnic Studies Committee,
26
Ethnic Studies Program,
26, 34-35, 38-39, 43-43,
76, 151-155, 185
Experimental College, 172

F

Faculty Senate, 33, 204,
260, 267, 273, 281, 292,
300, 301-307, 308, 309-
310, 313, 316, 322, 324-
326, 327, 336, 340, 342-
345, 349, 372-374, 379
Faculty Senate Athletic
Program Study Committee,
260-262, 294, 300-301,
336, 344-345, 373, 374
Faculty Senate Code Com-
mittee, 263-280, 308,
309
Far Western Conference,
239, 288, 363
FBI, 75
"Fiddler on the Roof,"
158
Finance Control Board, 59,
60, 61, 156, 164, 165
Florida Southern College,
331-332
Foreign students, 120,
388-391, 397-399, 400-
403, 412
Fowler, Donald, 270
Fry, Bob, 59

G

Gale, Charlotte B., 290
Gillum, Horace, 287
Goodman, Paul, 105
Gorrell, Robert M., 263,
355
Governor's Day, 406
Governor's Day [1970], 115,
265
Governor's Day Forum, 249
Grotegut, Eugene K., 2, 9,
290
Guild, Clark, 322

H

Haley, Alex, 152
Hall, Lynne M., 290

Hall, Dr. Wesley W., 213
Hannah, John A., 332
Hansen, Daniel, 353
Hardesty, Jim, 164, 171
Hattori, Henry, 261, 345
Hill, Col. Robert H., 91
Homecoming, 3-4, 70, 72
Honors Board, 103
Hug, Procter, Jr., 206,
247, 266
Hug, Procter, High School,
158
Hughes, Howard, 213-215
Human Relations Committee,
26, 32, 101
Humphrey, Neil, 210, 215,
269-270, 302, 304, 306,
313

I

Ihara, Craig, 40, 59, 60,
68, 69, 70, 95
Intercollegiate athletics,
7, 40, 51, 102, 111-113,
126-128, 129-130, 160,
239-240, 242, 260, 286-
288, 300, 338-339, 344,
360-379
Intercollegiate Athletic
Board, 360-361, 365-366,
368-369, 373, 378
Interim Code of Conduct,
219
International Students
Club, 386, 387, 400-402

J

Jacobsen, Harold, 202,
315, 352
Japanese-American students,
25, 28-31, 36-38, 40, 63
See also: Asian stu-
dents
Jeffers, Robert, 33
Jeffries, Leonard, 152
Jessup, Donald K., 303,
304, 306

"Jesus movement," 255-258,
259-260
Jot Travis Union, 246
Jot Travis Union Board,
59, 159
Juniper Hall, 141

K

Kerr, Clark, 222
Kess, Art, 4
Keyser, Charles Paul, 70
King, Billie Jean, 241
Kinney, Robert G., 176,
200
Kirkpatrick, Harold L.,
262, 323, 324
Klaich, Dan, 50, 95, 177,
178, 179, 186, 253, 301,
320
Kleiner, Edgar F., 323-324
Knudtsen, Molly, 354
Kosso, Eugene, 360

L

Lahren, Brian, 290
Laine, Michael, 251, 252
Laird, Charlton, 355
Lakhani, Abbas Ali, 386
Las Vegas, Nevada, 1, 6
Legislature (Nevada State),
43, 142, 166, 167-169,
234, 266, 354, 381, 408
Lesperance, Anthony L.,
360
Lincoln Hall, 143, 200
Loeffler, Kenneth, 260,
345
Logan, Thomas, 270
Loomis, Eve, 158
Lowrance, E. W., 284

M

Mace, 252
Mackay Day, 405-406
Malone, John, 260, 345

Malone, Robert, 71
 Manogue High School, 158
 Manzanita Hall, 141
 Manzanita Lake, 169-170
 Marschall, John P., 246, 300, 345
 Mastroianni, Robert, 54, 59, 86
 May, Wilbur, 323
 McDonough, Robert "Lefty," 1, 210-211
 Metzgar, Joseph, 151, 152
 Mexican-American [Chicano] students, 41, 53, 63, 150, 250
 Michigan State University, 331, 332
 Mikawa, James K., 27
 Military Affairs Board, 90, 93
 Miller, N. Edd, 4, 13, 33, 35, 55, 66-67, 71, 75, 77, 87, 88, 91, 97-98, 115, 116, 117, 157, 178, 180, 181, 186-187, 186a, 203, 204, 208-209, 211, 212, 213, 252, 262, 301, 313, 320, 339, 341, 355, 365, 369, 387
 Mills, Wilbur, 215
 Miltenberger, Patricia K., 35
 Moral turpitude, 278-279, 310-312, 340
 Mordy, Wendell, 203-204, 274
 Morehouse, Harold G., 343, 411
 Morrill Hall, 7
 Morris, William W., 97, 208, 211, 322, 349, 357
 Mortara, Faun, 151
 Moslem [religion], 389, 410
 Motley, Marion, 185
 Mozingo, Hugh N., 169, 260, 300, 342, 349
 Murphy, Pat, 169

N

National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 289
 National Collegiate Athletic Association, 378
 National Education Association, 12-13, 226, 316, 347
 National Society for Professors, 12-13, 225-226, 280-282, 308, 316-319, 346, 347, 379
 National Student Exchange Program, 292-293
 Neill, Alexander Sutherland, 105, 106
Nevada State Journal, 411
 News media, 1-2, 51-52, 70-71, 73, 74, 97, 98, 142, 180, 182, 207-208, 262, 307-308, 333-334, 343, 353
 North Las Vegas Community College, 216
 Nye Hall, 141, 388

O

O'Callaghan, "Mike," 352, 358
 Otani, William, 25
 Out-of-state tuition, 43-44, 295-296, 319-322, 390, 395-397

P

Padgett, Jim, 369-370
 Pakistan, 386, 390, 395
 Pappas, Dale, 143
 Patterson, Rich, 186
 Pentecostalism, 255, 258, 259-260
 Perriera, Pete, 159, 165, 345

Phoenix, David, 168
Police, 71, 75, 182, 251,
252
Porta, Mena M., 290
Potter, Mac, 172
Price, Jon, 158
Publications Board, 165

R

Raggio, William, 352, 356
Ravishankar, 406
Regents, Board of, 5, 11,
16, 17, 53, 54, 77, 90,
91, 92, 94, 95, 97, 98,
101, 102, 115-116, 123,
154, 160, 166, 186, 202-
213, 216, 217, 220-221,
223, 232, 243-245, 247-
248, 263-265, 268, 270,
272, 273, 275, 277, 281,
294, 301, 305, 311, 314,
318, 322, 348, 349, 354,
356-357, 374, 379
Reno, Nevada, 111-112
Reno Evening Gazette, 51,
262, 353, 411
Resident Assistant [RA],
139, 173, 200
Resignation threat [Presi-
dent Miller], 4-5, 77,
97-98, 115-117, 186-187,
186a, 208-213, 281, 300,
301, 391-392
Richardson, James T., 10-
11, 188-189, 204, 205-
206, 207, 274, 315, 345-
346
Richmond, Ada F., 290
Roberts, James S., 302,
304
Robinson, Ellen M., 290
Rodeo Club, 164, 172
ROTC, 54-55, 90-94, 96,
191, 294-295, 317, 404-
405

*Rules and Disciplinary
Procedures for Members of
the University Community*,
264, 267, 275, 278
Russell, Darlene S., 290

S

Sagebrush, 62, 164, 171,
320, 395
San Jose State College,
152
Santa Clara University,
239
School of Medicine, 213-
214, 227
Shirley, Jack, 44, 67,
331
Siegel, Richard, 26-27
Smith, Hal, 215
Special Admissions, 35,
101-102, 110
Special Services Program,
149, 296, 298
Spencer, Jack, 364, 367-
368
Stanford University, 152,
386, 401, 409
Steninger, Mel, 97, 208
Stout, Minard W., 348
Stratton, Myra R., 290
Sundowners, 73, 74, 180,
181, 352
Swackhamer, William, 215
Swope, Coe, 358

T

Talent Search, 296
Teacher-course evaluation,
130-132, 170-171, 189,
235-239, 324-329, 384-
385, 402-403
Tenure, 222-224, 242, 310,
375-376
Thornton, Barbara C., 290
Tompson, Robert N., 304,
305

Toy, Steve, 51
 Trachok, Richard M., 343,
 368, 369, 375
 Tyler, Jack S., 142

U

Undergraduate Council,
 100, 101
 University of California,
 Berkeley, 22, 23, 248,
 256, 347, 352
 University of California,
 Los Angeles, 23
 University of Kansas, 23
 University of Kentucky,
 22, 23
 University of Michigan, 23
 University of Nevada, Las
 Vegas, 203, 220, 225,
 239, 240, 318, 334
 University of Nevada,
 Reno, status of educa-
 tion at, 20-24, 32, 46-
 49, 80-81, 132-134, 172-
 174, 192, 226-228, 230-
 232, 283-285, 296-299,
 329-335, 351, 352-358,
 381-384, 397, 408, 414-
 417
 University of Nevada Sys-
 tem Senate, 273, 312-313
 University of New York,
 231
 University of Tennessee,
 331
 University Code, 219-220,
 263-280, 308-315, 318
 University Theater [UNR],
 158
 Upward Bound Project, 147-
 151, 296

V

Van Lydegraf, Lance, 164
 Veterans of Foreign Wars
 [VFW], 91
 Vreeland, Rebecca, 261

W

Wadsworth, James L., 214
 Walsh, Daniel, 205
 Washington, D. C., 192,
 194, 196-197
 Washington University, 102
 Wellinghoff, Jon, 102-103
 West Coast Athletic Con-
 ference, 364, 378
 Western Collegiate Ath-
 letic Conference, 239
 White Pine Hall, 139, 140-
 141, 143
 Whittemore, Robert G., 290
 Willis, James D. "Sporty,"
 199
 Winterberg, Friedwardt,
 274
 Wobblies, 347
 Wolfpack Boosters Associa-
 tion, 7, 129, 361, 369
 Women's athletics, 8, 128-
 129, 160, 240-241, 293
 Women's Recreation Asso-
 ciation, 164, 172, 293
 Women students, 160-163,
 293

XYZ

Zorn, R. J., 203

